

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

VOLUME XXXI.

JULY—DECEMBER, 1935

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

VOLUME XXVI

1901-1902

THE
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the VERY REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., THE DEANERY, EXETER, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXI

JULY, 1935

No. 181

EDITORIAL

THE article by Mr. Collins, which appears elsewhere, is published on the principle of *audi alteram partem*. The Editor expressed recently a considerable measure of disagreement with the conclusions of an article entitled "In Defence of Loisy," which had appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*. It was not supposed that the writer, who was not named in our columns, had committed himself to all M. Loisy's opinions, critical or theological. In fact, he expressly avoided doing that. But there were two suggestions in the article which seemed radically unsound. One was that the Christian religion could cut itself loose from history, and the other was that, if this were to be done, Christian theology would be in a stronger position. This was what we bluntly condemned as Theosophy. It has often been the dream of some eager souls that the Gospel might peradventure be established beyond the reach of critical assault. Of the Mythological school of a generation back, some, like J. M. Robertson, were frankly hostile to Christianity. They wished to destroy it, and thought that, if they could reduce it to myth, it would perish. Others, like Arthur Drews, B. W. Smith and K. C. Anderson, having a peculiar philosophy, supposed that by this means they could make Christianity impregnable. The word "myth" has become more respectable of late. But even so it is not impregnable to be established in the air. Leaving aside the vain hope of ever securing immunity from attack, is it a position which is in itself desirable, or edifying, or interesting to attain? We have all been encouraged by Mr. Baldwin's reference to the necessity of Christianizing the air, but this is a question of aerifying Christianity. We still think that old reply of St. Irenæus holds. He said, "But this is not the religion which has been handed down to us." After all, the first duty is to determine what Christianity is. There has been too much of "Do you like it?" and "Does it suit you?" and "Is it in harmony with modern thought?" and some-

times even of "What effect will it have on our own prospects of survival if we turn a cold eye on what is put forward as modern thought?" It is related that a distinguished Modernist once read a paper to a clerical society. At the end an old clergyman arose and said, "I do not ask whether all this is true. I only say, 'If it comes to be accepted, what will become of us?'" But such a question, however interesting to those concerned, is not fundamental. The fundamental duty is to discover what the Gospel is, and then either to accept it with such obedience of the head and heart as we can summon up, or to reject it. It is idle to accept something else, and then to expect to inherit the goodwill of the old firm. Such were the reflections that arose while we were expecting Mr. Collins' reply, which at the moment of writing these words we have not yet seen. He is more than welcome to the opportunity of making good his case. And if his winged words can make any of us less baldly traditionalist, less stiff-necked, less obscurantist, so much the better.

That we are not tied to the alternatives of rejecting Christian faith and of accepting something else instead is proved once again by Father Hebert's admirable book *Liturgy and Society* (Faber and Faber, 12s. 6d.). Father Hebert is so constant and valued a contributor that we even feel some delicacy in praising his work as it deserves. But it contains not merely what we have long waited for someone to say, but more than that. As a Maurician, the most faithful of all living disciples of the prophet, he discerns clearly that truth is a much wider thing than temperament, a much deeper thing than opinion. Convinced that Modernism is a misrepresentation of Christianity and therefore without the saving power of the Gospel, he turns for an explanation of what Christianity is to the Liturgy. But staunch Anglican as he is, his horizon is not filled and his mind is not obsessed with the sole merits of our own "incomparable liturgy." Staunch Catholic as he is, he knows that Liturgy must be judged by its power to inspire, illuminate and interpret life. Staunchly orthodox as he is, he is aware of all that is being said. Thus he is familiar with the anthropological evidence which shews that the universal ritual pattern is to be seen in the Christian Liturgy, and he meets the difficulties which are implied in this by affirming that Christianity (a) differs from the old paganisms in that it is historical ("This salvation-myth was enacted in the full light of history. This saviour-God really died and rose again"), and (b) that it fulfils the desires of the old paganisms in a satisfying way. One of the beautiful illustrations with which the book is enriched shews our Lady, actually "surrounded with pagan

symbols; yet she is no goddess, but the handmaid of the Lord, willing that it may be unto her according to His word."

It is the Liturgy which makes both the history and the fulfilment of desires available for us and for every generation. "In the Liturgy the past is apprehended as the present, and Bethlehem, Calvary, the Mount of Olives are brought into the *here* and the *now*. Or, better, the Liturgy is really enacted as in the heavenly places, and past, present and future alike are seen *sub specie æternitatis*." Thus the Eucharistic Prayer attributed to St. Gregory Nazianzen is illustrated by the reproduction of a mosaic from St. Mark's, Venice, of the Risen Lord trampling Satan under foot, shaking out of his hands the keys of death, and rescuing Adam and Eve. As Father Hebert pursues his argument it becomes more than ever clear, especially in the section headed "The Truth Shall Make You Free," that he is a Maurician—that is, neither identifying faith with correct beliefs, nor treating the dogma of the Church as if it were opinion. In the hope of a return to the true Catholicism, and as a safeguard against the individualism which has infected Catholic and Protestant alike, he hails the new Liturgical Movement on the Continent. Two of his pictures are reproductions of modern work from the studios of the Benedictine Abbey of Maria Laach, near Andernach in Germany, where the present writer thirty years ago had the good fortune to meet and talk to Father Daniels, who had been a friend of Henry Bradshaw. The remainder of the book is a profoundly interesting application of Christianity, conceived as dogma, liturgy and personal religion, to the facts of social, intellectual and artistic life. A few of his headings will shew the importance of his topics and the nature of his advice—"The ultimate issue is the conflict between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Man"; "The reality of God is the necessary presupposition of Christian worship"; "The redemption not merely of individual life but of social relations"; "The Church will fulfil her social duty in proportion as she realizes herself to be the Church"; "Radical defect of the arrangement by which the Sung Eucharist is separated from the Communion"; "The psalms are recited in the name of Christ and of the Church His body"; "The way to Reunion lies more through the mutual understanding of liturgical traditions than through the settlement of doctrinal differences"; "Christian art cannot be limited to ecclesiastical art. But in church building the Church is compelled to express herself."

Have we said enough to whet the appetites of readers?

The foregoing words were written before we had seen Mr. Collins' article. It has now come to hand, and, while we pay an admiring tribute to his zeal for the Kingdom, we wonder (a) what M. Loisy would think of this new defence, and (b) which of two meanings Mr. Collins wishes his article to bear. In the first place, if it is really the aim of M. Loisy to shew that "the validity of Christianity must be revealed in a living faith which Jesus inspires in men," we have no more to say. Everything, not only in the garden but in the house itself, is lovely. In the second place, Mr. Collins says at one point that "Christianity is rooted in history. It grows out of the historic Christ. . . . The life and death and Resurrection of Jesus are its roots." To this, again, we have nothing to add. It is exactly what this Journal has always understood by Historic Theology. What promised to be a very interesting controversy has fizzled out. We are in harmony, if not in unison, like St. Paul and St. James.

But there is another voice. "The uniqueness of the events lies in the fact that they have altered the course of history just because they have met with a response in humanity." But if that is all, the Resurrection of Christ is not an act of God. Or, if it is, it is that because we have made it that. It is Peter, not Jesus, after all. Again, Historical Christianity is said to mean a Christianity which is "alive and in harmony with the spiritual life and thought of the human race." But the spiritual life and thought of the human race are constantly changing, and are often bad. Must we not "prove the spirits"? Is Historical Christianity to be identified with whatever men choose to think and do? That means that you count heads and call the result Historical Christianity. Of course Mr. Collins does not mean that. He means whatever is best in the spiritual life and thought of the human race. But even so, it is human. And if that is to be the determining factor, you are open to the retort, "But why drag in Historical Christianity?"

Mr. Collins seems to have misunderstood Dr. Lowther Clarke and Mr. H. G. Wood rather seriously. He suggests that the former "neglects the part played by the faith of humanity in making human history," and that the latter is so rigid an adherent of the bald view of history that he forgets the inner light. It is a little hard on the priest who has for many years devoted his massive learning and his brilliant

gifts to the pastoral work of ministering by the printed word to simple people, and on the scholar who has been saved from the serene acquiescence in undue theosophistication which is an occasional defect in the fragrant quality of the Friends, by the fact that he is an historian. The Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K. is probably the most pastorally-minded of all living theologians. Mr. Wood attaches importance to facts without having lost any of his inner light. Finally, in one respect Mr. Collins has rather oddly misinterpreted what was said in our editorial columns. We suggested that certain eager spirits, desiring the coming of the Kingdom and the reign of the Gospel, offer the Church a glittering bribe if it will cut loose from an entangling, low-born alliance. Mr. Collins says, "If by that term we mean its relationships with ordinary men and women, it is just this alliance which is essential to Christianity." Of course that is essential. But has it ever been doubted? "I will never desert Mr. Micawber!" Quite right. But it hardly needed saying. On the other hand, "We do pray that Christianity may cut loose from its low-born alliances, if by that term we mean its slavery to a rigid authoritarianism; such an alliance kills the spirit and power of Christ in order to do honour to a credal statue, an idol." From this we also pray to be delivered. But in fact we meant neither of these things. The glittering bribe was the suggestion that Christianity would be stronger if it would cut loose from its limiting alliance with facts. It could then expatiate freely. We do not for our own part believe that the alliance with history is at all entangling. We believe that Christianity draws thence its motive power. Nor do we believe that it is low-born. For, though the Stable of Bethlehem was socially of no account, what came to pass in it was an Act of God.

THE MOSAIC RELIGION*

BEFORE we attempt to gain a picture of the religion of Israel, we must of course study the text of the Old Testament, which is our main authority. Excavations in Palestine and archaeological results teach us something, but we must turn to the pages of the Old Testament for the substance of the story.

In the study of the Old Testament we stand between Scylla and Charybdis, between two extremes of valuation of the text. By Scylla I mean the theory of verbal inspiration. Let me give you my own experience. I have been teaching from the Old Testament since 1885, now fifty years. I find it impossible on the theory of verbal inspiration to give any consistent picture of the religion of the Old Testament. If I attempt the task I find myself beset by a multitude of verbal contradictions. Small questions of numbers, dates, and names spring up on every side. And the proof (so-called) of the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament derived from passages cited from the New Testament falls far short of proof. It is easy to prove the great spiritual value of the Old Testament both from the New Testament and from our own daily inner experience, but verbal inspiration is a very different matter. It is contrary to the analogy of the Divine working. Our Lord chose fallible men to be his apostles: He did not send a legion of Angels to convert the World.

But if we avoid Scylla we may fall by Charybdis. I do not call Criticism itself Charybdis, but there are forms of it which are simply destructive, forms which are not scientific, forms which produce results which are perversely clever, sensationally new, but not guarded by the caution which belongs to true scholarship.

Literary Criticism is a tool not to be neglected, a necessary tool indeed if we are pursuing Facts, but withal a dangerous tool, given to slipping and to cutting away much that is valuable. I mean then by CHARYBDIS not Criticism itself, but an uncritical surrender to anything which is put forward as the newest result of Criticism.

The results of Criticism have to be criticized. Generally it may be asserted that *those* results are to be accepted which are based on study of large sections of the text. For instance the existence of Deutero-Isaiah, and the assignment to him of the chapters beginning with Isa. xl. are results firmly established. Again the individuality of the book of Deuteronomy, its great difference in character from the books of Genesis—Numbers,

* A lecture before the clergy of the diocese of Canterbury under the Way of Renewal. The writer has used some revised spellings as in his article in the May number of THEOLOGY.

cannot be seriously challenged. But on the other hand I doubt the validity of many of the results which are offered us from the literary examination of comparatively short sections. When, e.g., I am assured that Gen. i. is the composition of the Priestly writer of post-exilic time I feel shy. We are told that the Priestly Code is the work of a dull prosaic writer, whereas Gen. i. seems to me high poetry, but for a few phrases. The rhythmic march of the Seven Days is not prose to my ear!

We must use Criticism, I say, but having used it once, we must use it a second time on the results we have produced or accepted. To-day I shall try to give you NOT "the *latest* results of Biblical Criticism," but a few results which show a respect for the Biblical tradition, and at the same time can pass the tests of Criticism. I consider it proved that the Pentateuch as we have it is considerably later than the time of Moses, but further that it contains in brief summary the teachings of Israel's ancient Lawgiver, and I hold that with patience we are able to disentangle some of these from later matter, and so can give a true sketch (if it be but a sketch) of the religion of Israel as it was during the period of the Wilderness Wandering.

Now there are two passages in the Pentateuch which stand out from all the rest because they are described as having been written from the mouth of JEHOVAH on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses. In them if anywhere we expect to find the main contents of the Revelation made to the Lawgiver. One of these consists of Exod. xx. 1-17 with its parallel text Deut. v. 6-21. The other is found in Exod. xxxiv. 10-27: its importance was pointed out by the Poet-philosopher Goethe *circa* 1800; it was named by him the Ritual Decalog on account of the nature of its contents, for it deals largely with FEASTS, SACRIFICES and OFFERINGS. In contrast to it Exod. xx. 1-17 may be called the Moral Decalog. I shall distinguish the two passages by calling them simply Exod. xx. and Exod. xxxiv.

Now Criticism suggests that even Exod. xx. contains some later additions to its original text, and there are two or three facts which support the suggestion. The first is that THE END of the ivth commandment in Exod. xx. differs from that given in Deut. v. According to Exod. xx. Israel is to observe the seventh day because on the seventh day JEHOVAH rested from the work of Creation, but according to Deut. v. the obligation lies on Israel for the practical end that "thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou." The natural inference is that varying additions were made to the brief sentence, "KEEP HOLY THE SABBATH DAY," and that only the bare commandment can be safely ascribed to the original text. A second suggestive fact is that the vith, viith, viiith, and ixth commandments have

this short form, even in the present text. A third fact is that they were inscribed on stone, and stone encourages brevity. Certainly it encouraged brevity among the Hebrews for Palestine has suffered excavation for 60 or 70 years, but only one genuine Hebrew inscription—and that a short one—has come down to us from Old Testament times. The Hebrews could write, but they did not love writing.

I conclude that the X Commandments of Exod. xx. have been expanded from their original form.

The same theory of expansion applies also to Exod. xxxiv. 10-27. I have no time to go into this point, but I think you will see for yourselves if you read carefully that two elements are combined in this passage, namely, a text of commandments AND a commentary of exhortation arising out of the commandments.

My belief is that in the shorten'd text of Exod. xx. 1-17 and the shorten'd text of Exod. xxxiv. 10-27 we have the best information obtainable on the nature of the religion which Moses taught Israel in the Wilderness. But in saying this I add the caution that I do not thereby either assert or suggest that there is nothing else in the Pentateuch which can be ascribed to Moses. General negatives are unscholarly and come home to roost with those who make them. What I am now doing is to make the positive suggestion that the two Decalogs of Exodus give us the kernel of Mosaic teaching.

I commend to you as Mosaic Exod. xx. in the following shorten'd form:

EXODUS XX ("E")*

(MORAL DECALOG)

2. I am JEHOVAH thy God, [which brought thee out of the land of Egypt].

3. Thou shalt have none other gods before my face.

4. Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image.

7. Thou shalt not take (or "bear") the name of JEHOVAH thy God in vain.

8. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

12. Honour thy father and thy mother.

13. Thou shalt do no murder.

14. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

15. Thou shalt not steal.

16. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

17. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house (or "household").

* "E" denotes the early document call'd Elohistic by literary critics

But the claim that the X Commandments represent the Mosaic Religion has been questiond.

(1) It is urged that Exod. xx. 1-17 bears the mark of a later age. Befor considering this point let me mention on the other side the marks of the Wilderness sojourn which ar found in the passage. In the list of goods not to be coveted no mention is made of a man's FEELD ("his feeld" in Deut. v. 21). And heer it is right to remember that the command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house*" has no reference to bricks or mortar or building stone. The meaning of "house" is sho'en by the list of things which follo's, (and first) "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's WIFE." No translation can very wel be worse than, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's HOUSE." A good paraphrase is "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's TENT and all that is in it or belonging to it." The version in Exod. xx. is the nomad's version. The Deuteronomic form, which runs, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's house, nor his feeld," is a later form adapted to a settled agricultural life.

Writers on the Old Testament urge further that neither the iind nor ivth commandment can be Mosaic. I am myself quite unconvinced. The fact that images were revered in Israel from the earliest times by Gideon, by Micah the Ephraimite, and somewhat later by Jeroboam the son of Nebat, does not proov that Moses never issued the commandment forbidding them. Rather I accept the story which some dout, that Moses destroyd a golden calf (or bull) in the Wilderness. And if we accept the unique position ascribed (as I beleev) to JEHOVAH by Moses we can see WHY images were forbidden. If the image was ment to represent another god, it wou'd be treason to tolerate it, and if it were ment to represent JEHOVAH Himself, very serious objection to it remaind. For an image must hav some form, and the form wou'd inevitably tend to make the people forget the uniqueness of JEHOVAH for Israel. Egypt which Israel had just left was full of gods in forms of beasts. There were LION gods, BULL-gods, JACKAL-gods, SERPENT-gods; was JEHOVAH to hav one of these forms, so that the God who deliverd Israel from Egypt was to be easily confused with some Egyptian deity?

Again, we ar told that the ivth Commandment cannot be Mosaic. Why? Becauss, it is suggested, Nehemiah (*circ.* 444-432 B.C.) was the first person to insist strongly upon the sabbath. But on the contrary Ezekiel (xx. 10-26) more than a hundred years erlier makes an earnest demand for its observance. Further, Jeremiah, Ezekiel's contemporary, challenges the kings of Judah for impressing servants to bear burdens on the sabbath (Jer. xvii. 19 ff.). Jehoiakim the oppressiv king wanted to

hurry on his palace-building (Jer. xxii. 13 ff.). Literary critics contest the genuineness of Jeremiah's championship of the sabbath, but they ignore the fact that Jeremiah was pre-eminently the champion of oppressed servants (xxxiv. 12 ff.) and that the sabbath law was the labourer's charter. Amos (viii. 5) scourges the corn merchants who complain that the sabbath passes slowly, when they have wheat to sell.

And there is a general consideration to be weighed. WHICH period was better adapted for THE INTRODUCTION of a Sabbath ordinance—an agricultural period, or a pastoral? Certainly the difficulty was greater for agriculture, as the form of the command in Exod. xxxiv. 21 suggests; "In plowing time and in harvest thou shalt rest." Plowing and gathering in the harvest mean all day work, whereas leading the cattle to water is the work of an hour. The keeping of the sabbath was in the power of the employer: he was taught by the ivth commandment to abstain from putting his servants to work for seven days in the week. This lesson was given surely in the patriarchal days when the whole clan traveled together and all shared the hardships of the wilderness. When Israel entered Canaan and settled down to agricultural work, he had already received the lesson that his servants must have one day's rest in seven. We must not forget that the Hebrew ivth Commandment, "Thou shalt not exact seven days' work a week from thy labourers," is totally different from the Puritan ivth Commandment, "Thy little boy shall not run about and play on Sunday."

A very pervers bit of Old Testament criticism (to my mind) is the view that the moral commandments of Sinai were not original but were compiled from the teaching of the prophets of the eighth century. Amongst other passages critics appeal to Hosea iv. 2, "There is nought but swearing and breaking faith, | and killing, | and stealing, | and committing adultery." The last three terms are used in the vith, the viiith, and the viiith commandments. So these three commandments are borrowed, we are asked to believe, from Hosea and his brother prophets, and of course are much later than the days of Moses.

A more natural view is surely that Hosea and his brethren are recalling Israel to obedience to their ancient laws. There is a similar appeal in Hosea xi. 1, "When Israel was a child then I loved him and called him out of Egypt to be my son." There is a reproach for neglect of the commandments in the words of viii. 12, "Thou I write for him my law in ten thousand [precepts] they are counted as a strange thing."

We learn from the Decalog of Exod. xx. that the fundamental doctrine of Israel's religion under Moses was the Uniqueness of JEHOVAH as the God of Israel: we learn also from the same source

that even at this early period Israel possess the moral law which our Lord took as his text for the Sermon on the Mount. But we have still to ask, What organisation was there for the preservation of the Mosaic religion? Moderns may scoff at the thought of Religion, TRUE RELIGION, needing any organisation—indeed many seem to think that organisation is in itself anti-religious—yet it is a fact that ancient religions had organisation and also that they needed it.

In *Exod. xx.* Organised Religion appears only in the ivth Commandment, the obligation to keep the sabbath holy. But in *Exod. xxxiv.* Organisation occupies much space.

EXODUS XXXIV ("J")*

(RITUAL DECALOG)

14. Thou shalt worship no other god: for JEHOVAH, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God.

17. Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.

18. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread.

19. All that openeth the womb is mine.

21. Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest. . . .

22 f. Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, . . . and the feast of ingathering. . . . Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord JEHOVAH. [20. And none shall appear before me empty.]

25. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.

26. The first of the firstfruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of JEHOVAH thy God.

Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.

The worship of JEHOVAH is regulated, and His dues are fixed. There are to be three feasts and at each of them all males are to appear before THE LORD with an offering. Unleavened loaves are to be eaten for seven days on the first of the three feasts. The sabbath is to be observed even when agricultural work is a pressing need. Firstfruits and all first-born are to be offered to JEHOVAH. Leavened bread is not to be offered. Since Religion must have an outward form as well as an inward spirit, the Decalog of *Exod. xxxiv.* supplies a needed supplement to the Decalog of *Exod. xx.* But it will be noted that we have not thus far found any arrangements for a priesthood. Those given in *Leviticus—Numbers* are probably later than Moses.

* "J" denotes the early document called Jahvist by critics.

Befor passing on an objection of some importance to the Mosaic origin of Exod. xxxiv. must be noticed. This Decalog contains several references to crops and agriculture, while the life in the Wilderness was pastoral, a life of shepherds. True, but we may answer, "Yes, mainly pastoral, but not wholly non-agricultural." The nomads of Arabia of to-day cultivate the date-palm: indeed they could not exist without the date-harvest: and they also grow small quantities of barley. Tho' the tribes move from spot to spot for the sake of fresh pasture, they do return to certain relatively fixt camping places.

But above all we must attribute to a hungry tribe of the desert, which had once kno'en the flesh-pots and the "cucumbers" and the "leeks" and the "onions" of Egypt, the desire for the cultivated lands with their regular supplies of food (Num. xi. 4 f.). Moses (or the God of Moses) legislates a little ahead for the conquerors of Canaan.

And now we hav to consider the main objection to the view which I hav set befor you, the objection that there is no trace of the existence of such a Mosaic religion in the period coverd by the book of Judges and the erly chapters of 1 Samuel. There is nothing, as far as I am aware, to sho that the Ten Commandments of Exod. xx. had any influence for some centuries after Joshua and his generation. On the contrary it is written in the book of Judges, "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud. xvii. 6). It was Israel's "Dark Age."

The book of Judges, we find, has gathered to itself something of the tone of the Dark Age. When it is describing the events of the time such as the exploits of Ehud or Samson or Abimelech's seezure of kingly power or the atrocity of Gibeah of Benjamin it seems to us a secular history. Certainly the period was very dark in its lack of true religious inspiration. Its heroes ar half hethen in their acts. Gideon set up as a trophy of his victory a golden ephod, a holy coat at Ophrah, and peple did *pūjah* to it as tho' it were an idol (viii. 27); Jephthah sacrificed his daughter to JEHOVAH (xi. 30 f., 39); the mother of Micah had a graven image—i.e., an image of wood with a covering of silver made in fulfilment of a vow to JEHOVAH (xvii. 1-5). David's wife kept *tērāphim* in the house.

All this is alien from the Mosaic religion and especially from the X Commandments.

When we consider this dark age, this very dark age, we cannot help asking, "Can Israel's religion in the Wilderness hav been safely transmitted throu' such a period? *Who* transmitted it? *How* was it transmitted? What CORRIDOR was there by which a faithful tradition of Moses' teaching could safely pass

throu' the harassed and lawless centuries which separated Moses from Elijah?"

Certainly such a corridor could not have been provided by men like Ehud and Gideon and Jephthah, the champions of Israel in War. They had their part to play, but they were not successors of Moses: they were not teachers of God's Law to Israel. They fought with the sword, but not with the sword of the spirit.

But there was a corridor which stretched throu' the dark age of the Judges. It may be described *either* as a corridor of persons *or* as a corridor of territory. In fact it included both. When we think of the history of Israel we dwell too much on Samaria and Jerusalem, the two political capitals, both of them west of Jordan in Canaan proper. But the Promised Land included the territory of the two and a half tribes east of Jordan (Joshua xiv. 3), the land of Gilead which Reuben and Gad claim'd for themselves with the words, "This is a land for cattle, and thy servants have cattle: . . . bring us not over Jordan" (Num. xxxii. 4, 5). There (as the Song of Deborah complains), "Reuben sat (still) to listen to the pipings for the flocks . . . and Gilead abode beyond Jordan" (Judg. v. 16 f.). But if Gilead failed Deborah and Barak on a critical occasion, Gilead throu' the centuries perform'd a great service for the whole of Israel. East of Jordan on the plateaux the two and a half tribes kept up the old pastoral life of Israel. They inherited the land flowing with milk and (wild) honey, while their brethren west of Jordan learnt agriculture and polytheism from the remnant of the Canaanites, or sank into an idle city life. The old traditions of Israel were preserved east of Jordan, and it was from Gilead that Elijah the Tishbite came to deliver to Israel the challenge, "If JEHOVAH be the God, follow Him, but if the Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings xviii. 21).

Certainly we must look East of Jordan for the region in which the Mosaic tradition was best preserved. Why indeed does the opening of the book of Deuteronomy insist so strongly on the fact that Moses began to declare (or "interpret": Heb. *bē'ēr*) this law (this *tōrāh*) "beyond Jordan in the land of Moab" (Deut. i. 5)? Why again does the close of Deuteronomy assert so definitely that Moses died and was buried in a valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor (Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6)? Does it not testify to the belief of Israel that the Mosaic tradition was preserved in its purity East (and not West) of Jordan? Otherwise why this stress upon Moab, which compels the reader to look eastward? But further it is to be observed that elsewhere (Deut. iv. 46) the place in which Moses "set the law before the children of Israel" is described slightly differently as "Beyond

Jordan in the valley over against Beth-peor in the land of Sihon king of the Amorites." No doubt the border of Moab varied from time to time owing to the wars. Moreover it shou'd be noted that the two expressions used in Deut. i. 5, "declare ("interpret") this law," and in Deut. iv. 44, "The law which Moses set before the children of Israel," presuppose (not an original delivery of a law but) the act of enforcing a law already givn.

Ex Oriente lux is the motto for those who seek to know about the Mosaic religion. It is east of Jordan where the traditions of the great lawgiver persisted. It was Sihon and Og the kings beyond Jordan whom "*Moses and the children of Israel smote*" (Deut. iv. 46). It was beyond Jordan that Moses himself chose out three cities of Refuge (Deut. iv. 41 f.). The west of Jordan preserv's rather the name of Joshua, as Conqueror and Distributer of Canaan.

But the Corridor was not only a corridor of territory: it was also a corridor of persons. There were "gilds" or "societies" in those days. Do not think the statement impossibly modern! There were pasture lands also west of Jordan, specially on the Judæan hills, and we may truly say that the torch of Elijah, after the lapse of a century, was receev'd by the hand of the herdman Amos. But I am anticipating here. My object is to point out that the east of Jordan was not the only district in which the old traditions of Israel were treasured.

There was, I said, a human as well as a territorial corridor throu' Israel's dark age. But we shall not find it in the persons of the prominent men who gave their names to the book of Judges—not in Ehud, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah or Samson.

We must look to a class of persons less conspicuous in the political history of the period in order to find the upholders of the faith of Moses. In the first book of Samuel (x. 5) there is a casual reference to a company of PROPHETS (χóρος προφητῶν) who met Saul. The period is still that of the Judges, and these "prophets" are mentioned as a known institution. From their connexion with Samuel we may draw the conclusion that they were persons specially devoted to JEHOVAH. Here then we may reasonably find a Corridor for transmitting the substance of the teaching of Moses. Yet another trace of the human corridor is to be found. There were, whether on the east or on the west of Jordan, the Rechabites, a clan who neither sowed seed nor planted vineyards, but held to a pastoral life as to a religion (Jer. xxxv.). These pastoral sections of Israel kept alive the memory of Israel's sojourn in the Wilderness and of JEHOVAH's care for His people in "a land not sown." From among the shepherd race came Elijah from Gilead in the ixth century,

and Amos from the Judæan hills in the viiith century to recall Israel from wine and ivory palaces to the simplicities of a pastoral life, and to a closer walk with JEHOVAH their own God from the days of the Wilderness Wandering. And the Providence of God gave to Israel in Canaan the moving story of Abraham as a sojourner (Heb. xi. 9), dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob the heirs with him of the same promise (*συνκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς*). The wonderful stories of Genesis were Israel's Epic, an Iliad and an Odyssey combined, to keep him in mind of the fact that his ancestors wer shepherds first in Palestine, then in Egypt, and afterwards in the wilderness of Sinai. Shepherds wer not rooted to one spot, they wer travelers in constant search for pastures new, and Israel's God was not the local God of Canaan but God of all lands.

Accepting, then, as a fact the existence of a corridor suited for the transmission of higher religious teaching throu' centuries of anarchy and ignorance, we hav further to ask, Was there sufficient power in the Mosaic doctrine to carry it safely throu' such unfavourable conditions? There need be no hesitation in answering this question with an emphatic Yes. From the two Decalogs we deduce the conclusion that Moses held a doctrine concerning God which was both definite and powerful in its appeal. He taught Israel *not* about a God, nor about *gods*, but about THE GOD. The God of Israel possest a name—a proper Name. Remember that Juliet's question in Shakespere, What's in a name? does not apply in the East. There a Name is always significant. The God who revealed Himself throu' Moses was distinguisht from the crowd of Gentile gods by a proper Name. He stood alone in His Majesty: for Him there were no assistant gods or councillors: other gods might hav images: but no image coud represent JEHOVAH. From the bewildering collection of gods major and minor JEHOVAH stood apart. We remember that the Christian Apologist Tatian in his hethen days was drawn to Christianity when he found in the Old Testament τῶν ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικόν (*Oratio*, § 29)—the doctrine that the Universe has but one Ruler. It is definite doctrine unflinchingly held which prevails. The parallel case of Mohammed tells the same story, "Allah ("the God"): there is none other than He," and with that announcement the prophet of Islam destroyed 365 idols out of the Temple of Mecca.

And JEHOVAH the God of Israel had not only a unique name, but in addition a story attacht to the name, the story of the foundation of the people of Israel. "It was JEHOVAH who brought Israel out of Egypt: it was NOT the peple who brought themselves out: they were a horde of trembling slaves: it was NOT Moses who brought them out: he had once essayed to be a

Jordan in the valley over against Beth-peor in the land of Sihon king of the Amorites." No doubt the border of Moab varied from time to time owing to the wars. Moreover it should be noted that the two expressions used in Deut. i. 5, "declare ("interpret") this law," and in Deut. iv. 44, "The law which Moses set before the children of Israel," presuppose (not an original delivery of a law but) the act of enforcing a law already given.

Ex Oriente lux is the motto for those who seek to know about the Mosaic religion. It is east of Jordan where the traditions of the great lawgiver persisted. It was Sihon and Og the kings beyond Jordan whom "Moses and the children of Israel smote" (Deut. iv. 46). It was beyond Jordan that Moses himself chose out three cities of Refuge (Deut. iv. 41 f.). The west of Jordan preserves rather the name of Joshua, as Conqueror and Distributer of Canaan.

But the Corridor was not only a corridor of territory: it was also a corridor of persons. There were "gilds" or "societies" in those days. Do not think the statement impossibly modern! There were pasture lands also west of Jordan, specially on the Judæan hills, and we may truly say that the torch of Elijah, after the lapse of a century, was received by the hand of the herdsman Amos. But I am anticipating here. My object is to point out that the east of Jordan was not the only district in which the old traditions of Israel were treasured.

There was, I said, a human as well as a territorial corridor through Israel's dark age. But we shall not find it in the persons of the prominent men who gave their names to the book of Judges—not in Ehud, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah or Samson.

We must look to a class of persons less conspicuous in the political history of the period in order to find the upholders of the faith of Moses. In the first book of Samuel (x. 5) there is a casual reference to a company of PROPHETS (χóρος προφητῶν) who met Saul. The period is still that of the Judges, and these "prophets" are mentioned as a known institution. From their connexion with Samuel we may draw the conclusion that they were persons specially devoted to JEHOVAH. Here then we may reasonably find a Corridor for transmitting the substance of the teaching of Moses. Yet another trace of the human corridor is to be found. There were, whether on the east or on the west of Jordan, the Rechabites, a clan who neither sowed seed nor planted vineyards, but held to a pastoral life as to a religion (Jer. xxxv.). These pastoral sections of Israel kept alive the memory of Israel's sojourn in the Wilderness and of JEHOVAH's care for His people in "a land not sown." From among the shepherd race came Elijah from Gilead in the ixth century,

and Amos from the Judæan hills in the viiith century to recall Israel from wine and ivory palaces to the simplicities of a pastoral life, and to a closer walk with JEHOVAH their own God from the days of the Wilderness Wandering. And the Providence of God gave to Israel in Canaan the moving story of Abraham as a sojourner (Heb. xi. 9), dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob the heirs with him of the same promise (*συνκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς*). The wonderful stories of Genesis were Israel's Epic, an Iliad and an Odyssey combined, to keep him in mind of the fact that his ancestors were shepherds first in Palestine, then in Egypt, and afterwards in the wilderness of Sinai. Shepherds were not rooted to one spot, they were travelers in constant search for pastures new, and Israel's God was not the local God of Canaan but God of all lands.

Accepting, then, as a fact the existence of a corridor suited for the transmission of higher religious teaching throu' centuries of anarchy and ignorance, we have further to ask, Was there sufficient power in the Mosaic doctrine to carry it safely throu' such unfavourable conditions? There need be no hesitation in answering this question with an emphatic Yes. From the two Decalogs we deduce the conclusion that Moses held a doctrine concerning God which was both definite and powerful in its appeal. He taught Israel *not* about a God, nor about *gods*, but about THE GOD. The God of Israel possesseth a name—a proper Name. Remember that Juliet's question in Shakespeare, What's in a name? does not apply in the East. There a Name is always significant. The God who revealed Himself throu' Moses was distinguished from the crowd of Gentile gods by a proper Name. He stood alone in His Majesty: for Him there were no assistant gods or councillors: other gods might have images: but no image could represent JEHOVAH. From the bewildering collection of gods major and minor JEHOVAH stood apart. We remember that the Christian Apologist Tatian in his heathen days was drawn to Christianity when he found in the Old Testament *τῶν ὅλων τὸ μοναρχικόν* (*Oratio*, § 29)—the doctrine that the Universe has but one Ruler. It is definite doctrine unflinchingly held which prevails. The parallel case of Mohammed tells the same story, "Allah ("the God"): there is none other than He," and with that announcement the prophet of Islam destroyed 365 idols out of the Temple of Mecca.

And JEHOVAH the God of Israel had not only a unique name, but in addition a story attached to the name, the story of the foundation of the people of Israel. "It was JEHOVAH who brought Israel out of Egypt: it was NOT the people who brought themselves out: they were a horde of trembling slaves: it was NOT Moses who brought them out: he had once essayed to be a

leader, but he had renounced his effort, and taken refuge in Midian: it was JEHOVAH who brought Israel out of Egypt." (I slightly paraphrase a passage from F. D. Maurice.) Thus began the history of Israel as a nation.

The present text of the X Commandments in Exod. xx. begins, "I am JEHOVAH thy God, *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt from the house of servants.*" Critics suppose that the relativ clause is an addition to the original text, chiefly because "from the house of servants" is a phrase occurring six times in Deuteronomy, and due in Exod. xx. to Deuteronomic influence. But even if the critics are right, the omission of the clause is not a serious matter. There are too many references in early passages of the Old Testament to JEHOVAH's deliverance of Israel from Egypt to allow us to think that the tradition is anything else than original of the Mosaic age. I have no time to quote, but I cite the following passages: 1 Kings xii. 28 f.; Amos iii. 1; Hosea xi. 1; Jer. ii. 2: cf. Ps. c. 3.

In short Israel was given through Moses a faith rooted in history. JEHOVAH was not a variable Nature-God sending alternately good harvests and bad, but a God Who had revealed Himself to Israel by a great Deliverance. Israel could not forget Pharaoh's tyranny: Egypt was too near to be forgotten. Centuries after Moses, when Egypt had lost her former conquests, the spell of her power still rested upon Israel. Indeed behind her frontier of canals and swamps and border fortresses she was still strong. She had horses and chariots and ships. Now and again the later Pharaohs showed courage, energy, and a spirit of adventure.

This Egypt had been for Israel "the house of bondage." Their fathers had made bricks there, and JEHOVAH had delivered them from toiling with "the basket," and removed "their shoulder from the burden" (Ps. lxxxi. 6). Not even that fortified frontier could keep them prisoners and slaves. Under divine guidance they crossed the sea (*θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς*). JEHOVAH brought them forth from Egypt: a weak and cowardly people from a strong nation, to gain a national life and a land of their own.

So through the long corridor of time came the revelation from Mosaic times which drew from Israel of later days the answering confession:

"We were Pharaoh's bondmen, in Egypt, and JEHOVAH brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand . . . to give us the land which He swore unto our fathers" (Deut. vi. 21).

In memory of that deliverance every male Israelite was to appear before JEHOVAH in thankful remembrance with an offering in his hand three times in the year as Moses had enjoined; and

further, in memory of their release from the hard service of Pharaoh, Israel was to allow his servant and his maid, his ox and his ass, and (I think) also the stranger in his household, a day of rest every seventh day.

The Religion of the Wilderness was rich in spiritual values, but two features perhaps stand out as characteristic for Israel above the rest.

(1) The doctrine of the One God and Saviour, who delivered his people from Egyptian bondage—JEHOVAH is His Name; and

(2) The gift of the Sabbath to the servants in Israel, a perpetual reminder to their masters that they too had once been bearers of burdens under a taskmaster.

W. EMERY BARNES.

PUBLIC SCHOOL SERMONS

THERE is a story, in the recently published *Life of Gerald du Maurier*, of a visiting preacher who told the assembled Harrovians that Life was a game of cricket in which there were three wickets (so he said): they were Honour, Truth and Purity: and Temptation was the bowler. I do not know whether this is a warning against the use of sporting metaphors in the pulpit, or merely a hint that if used, they should be used correctly. But it is a curious thing how soon we forget, or idealize, our school-days. It being part of my duty to listen to, as well as to preach, many school sermons, I offer in all humility a few thoughts to those who have to do the same thing less frequently.

Generalizations in this case are probably no more unfair than most: but the public school boy is a curious creature. One might think at first that an ordinary parish congregation would show much more variety than such a highly specialized collection of humans as a school. This may be true. I should be inclined to omit the "much." Variety is given to the school congregation mainly by age. There will probably be a preparatory school present, and the youngest member of it in the region of nine years old. When it is remembered that the oldest sixth-former will be nineteen, that ten years' span of young life is seen to be rather large, and to include such different attitudes towards the world that the preacher may well despair of saying anything that will be of use to both extremes.

Those years are the most conservative years of life. Blind acceptance of what is "good form," and a horror of doing anything out of the ordinary, are probably more pronounced than

at any other period. This, in a more or less modified form, is probably a characteristic of any institution. It seems inevitable when the members of it live, eat and sleep together, do their school work and play their games together, and when moments of privacy are few and far between. If the criticism is true that the English system produces a certain definite type—and it is probably a valid criticism—then it is well if we who preach can at least understand the characteristics of that type.

One might perhaps doubt whether the fear of originality is greater within the public school circle than outside it. Probably the world as a whole torments its original thinkers, and even its leaders in action, just as much. And originality does survive a public school education at the present day. With the enormous development of education in art and music, and the great variety of out of school societies and activities other than the traditional organized games, the boy who is "not good at games" can generally find one or more ways in which his personality can develop. But in view of the problem of reaching, stirring the hearts of, and teaching the maximum number in this particular congregation, we must recognize the existence of the "public school type."

Whether the preparatory school, if it attends chapel, can fairly expect often to have a sermon suitable for its years, seems to me to be doubtful. The interests of a small boy are so different from those of his elder brother. Some schools have solved this by having a separate service and a different sermon. In spite of the extra work involved this has generally proved worth while; nor need this division be made every Sunday. On the other hand, even if the small boy seems to fasten upon irrelevant and frivolous points, and to have understood little of the more serious part of the sermon, he has not gained nothing; psychologists would bear out the statement that unconscious absorption of atmosphere may count for much. They would also agree that the preparatory school age is essentially a more religious age than the age of puberty. The behaviour of the boy is better, on the whole, at this age, and he attends better; and his attention is sometimes better rewarded.

*Pace Canon Quick** I should say that the main interest of the boy of 14 to 17, if not 19, was a practical one. He wants to hear whether the Christianity which he is taught, with greater or lesser enthusiasm, has any relevance to the world into which he will go. He is certain to have met many people already—masters included—who are not convinced of that relevance. It is an enormously important problem to him. Only during the last year or so of school life, as a general rule, will the intellectual

* Writing in THEOLOGY, April, 1935.

interest begin to awaken, and the boy, if he has brains, begins to go into details of text and interpretation of Bible, creeds or Prayer Book. Of course, the University will see much more of this investigation; but the school's interest is primarily practical. For this reason sermons from people who have done things themselves seem to be so attractive. Missionary activity, related in the right way, can prove absorbing. Talks from men who have organized housing schemes, from representatives of bodies like the I.C.F. or the Franciscan Homes for Young Wayfarers, and countless other practical activities of the Church, also suggest themselves as interesting. One may perhaps borrow a hint from this and cast an ordinary doctrinal sermon into the form of what people have done, and find it more interesting than the plain statement of abstract principle.

There is perhaps room for doubt about the position of the teaching sermon (using the adjective in its narrower sense). I have no doubt about its value and necessity in a parish: it is almost the parish priest's only chance to instruct his flock. But the boys in chapel have had, during six weekdays, many hours of instruction in secular subjects, and probably two hours of Bible study. This latter may not have been adequately done, but the preacher can hardly assume it is his place to fill up deficiencies. So it may be best on the whole to avoid that type of sermon which consists of a detailed exposition of a text or parable.

A preacher may also forget that he is addressing an assembly who are present under compulsion: that if as rector or vicar he bores his congregation they are at liberty to stay away, but that the schoolboy has no such alternative offered to him. Compulsory attendance at chapel services is matter for another educational controversy, upon which I have no wish to enter; but taking the facts as they are, the congregation are present because they will be punished if they are not. It is perhaps more credit to a school's good manners and sense of discipline than we might be inclined to allow, that this fact of compulsion does not seem to obtrude itself unduly. But it also means that the preacher must expect to have to win the attention of his congregation to a much larger extent than that of a congregation who have come (probably) in order to hear him.

Again, our preacher, if he is unused to this type of sermon, will look down at this seemingly homogeneous assembly, and will be struck at once with the immense potentialities of the young lives which he sees before him: perhaps some few words, or a happy illustration of his, will remain in their minds and they will take it away with them as an abiding memory of their school chapel. I hope he will stop to reflect that many other preachers

have felt exactly the same thing, and have expressed their hope from the pulpit. Nine out of ten visiting preachers say this; it can now be taken as said.

That one must speak a language "understood of the people" is a truism. On the assumption that games of one sort or another are the sole interest of the schoolboy's life, so many preachers, like Gerald du Maurier's Harrovian, think that a point is best illustrated in the language of a game. It is true that games are the sole interest of many boys' lives, that most public-school boys would be better educated if they learned that there are more important things than games, and that only a very few boys ought to take more interest in games than they in fact do. But again, so many preachers have brought up this before; it is hackneyed, spoiled by repetition, *crambe repetita*. And deep down I think that most boys consider such illustrations rather beneath the dignity of the pulpit. They tend to have an exaggerated sense of what is dignified; it is part of their tremendous suspicion that they are being "preached down to." Preaching down to people never pays. The general average of intelligence of a congregation is always higher than one expects. It might be well also to remember that the public school congregation will certainly be just as intelligent, and probably more intelligent, than the average congregation of adults taken from all classes of society. The adults, because they have lived longer, may know more facts, but the boys' powers of understanding quickly, provided they are attending, are highly trained.

I suppose we all try to avoid the "gentle Jesus meek and mild" type of character-drawing—in our sermons at any rate, if not in our hymns. I have heard preachers go to the other extreme, and in their attempts to be "hearty" use language which is in fact grossly irreverent. Of course, the irreverence is noticed at once, and ridicule is the result, instead of edification. Perhaps it is for the same reason that the attempt at intimacy when the preacher begins to address his hearers as "you fellows" so seldom seems to be effective. It is extraordinarily hard to know exactly what method of address to use. You may call adults "my friends," and they will accept the convention, even though they have never seen you before: a boy will take it literally and will see it as insincere. Or you may call them "my dear people," or even "my brothers and sisters," and they will not take you literally. I have even heard a congregation addressed by their vicar, who evidently took his pastoral duties literally, as "My dear sheep." None of these are of any use for boys; to address them with a thundering "Boys" seems the prerogative of a headmaster with a presence: I have found no alternative to the plain pronoun "you."

Of course all these are silly little points and few of them affect in essentials the message which a man has to deliver. But when your congregation find it hard to see past the little mannerisms of speech and gesture which so many of us acquire, these points do perhaps become important, and it is certainly worth while to avoid the causes of stumbling. Even to use the word "college" when you mean "school" has been known to obtrude itself so much that attention has wandered. I think that those excellent "variety" artists, the Western brothers, have probably unwittingly done a considerable service to education with their references to the "old school tie." Your public school type tends so much to clannishness and snobbery that a little gentle fun poked at his foibles may well lead him on the way that leads to reformation. But until that reform is completed, we whose duty and privilege it is to take a part, however small, in their education, may well decide that a certain attention to detail and technique will enable us to make the fullest use of our tremendous opportunities.

W. H. OLDAKER.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE FAITH OF HUMANITY

It is agreed, even by his opponents, that Monsieur Loisy has contributed generously to the advance of the critical study of the Bible. But his adversaries misjudge him when they label him as a sceptic. It is his purpose to keep alive and active the essential elements of the Christian religion by releasing it from the fetters of false theories which would strangle it; his aim is constructive, his desire is to shew that the validity of the claims of Christianity is not dependent upon an ability to demonstrate that this or that extract from the Gospels is literally an exact record of what actually happened, but must be revealed in a living faith which Jesus inspires in men. He believes that the power of Christ must act in a fellowship of persons, who, by faith, see in and through Him the love of God actively operative in the world. A Christianity which is alive must, therefore, adapt itself in accordance with the spiritual and moral perceptions of each successive age. If to deny this is to be orthodox, then orthodoxy may be likened to a branch which is cut away from the tree of life.

Monsieur Loisy has his own particular interpretation of Christianity. But we may take certain fundamental aspects

of his interpretation as representative of the ideas of many people who are trying to understand Christianity in the light of modern life and thought. Comments made in the May number of THEOLOGY, in regard to my article "In Defence of Loisy," published in the April number of the *Hibbert Journal*, together with the article "Guignebert and Loisy," by Dr. Lowther Clarke, lead me to try to justify the suggestion that in M. Loisy may be seen "a figure who has taken a great step in causing the Christian religion to clothe itself in a new theological form; a form which shall give it the freedom to expand itself and adapt itself to meet the needs of a modern world which longs to find the way of salvation."

Dr. Lowther Clarke rightly recognizes that the issue involved in any attempt to interpret the Gospels is largely concerned with the problem of the nature of history. But, in following H. G. Wood's "Christianity and the Nature of History," he makes the mistake of neglecting the part played by the faith of humanity in making history; and also, in suggesting that M. Loisy believes that the disciples were greater than Jesus, he fails to do him justice and gives a misleading idea of his views on the nature of history.

Mr. Wood suggests that "events that make history are happenings or actions which change the human situation," and he believes that history is a "unique series of events, a genetic process which cannot be repeated and of which the decisive moments are creative acts of individuals embodying values with a wide and universal appeal . . ."; but he does not make it sufficiently clear both that a series of events will be of no significance where there is no response in humanity to the values they embody, and also that the events will be recorded in accordance with the degree of perception of the faith of humanity. For example, the records of the life of Jesus in the Gospels are historical only for those who, by faith, respond to the values embodied in them; and the facts recorded have been written in the light of the faith of those who interpreted them in the belief that Jesus is the Son of God.

Monsieur Loisy does not, as Dr. Lowther Clarke suggests he does, believe that the disciples were greater than Jesus. But he affirms that our knowledge of the events of our Lord's life is given to us by those who already had faith in Him as the Saviour of the world; apart from the faith of the disciples, the events of the life of Christ could only have been recorded as a succession of bare facts; apart from our own faith and the faith of humanity, we can now discern in the Gospels only the barest outlines of a human being without significance, "a deluded prophet," a "pale Galilean." Bare facts are a

physical reality just as any other natural phenomena; the Gospel records are historical, not because they can be proved scientifically to be true, but because the unique event of the life of Jesus embodies in it values to which the faith of men all through the ages has responded. Historical research, if it rules out *ab initio* the interpretations put upon facts, discovers a series of events without any soul; for it is faith which gives to a fact its soul.

What, then, is the relation of Christianity to history, and how far is it true to say that the Gospel records are historical?

"The nature of God's love is to be read not in generalities or parables, but in the life and death of Jesus. . . . Things can never be the same again now that Christ has died." It is true that Christianity cannot be disassociated from the historical Jesus. The life and death and Resurrection of Christ are unique events upon which the Christian religion is founded. But we must go one step further; the uniqueness of the events lies in the fact that they have altered the course of history just because they have met with a response in humanity. The faith of men in Christ has led them to perceive the events to be of unique significance, and to clothe them in forms adapted to their understanding. Mr. Wood himself seems to recognize that this further step should be taken when he points out that he does not wish to follow Carlyle and to say that history is made by a limited number of heroic individuals, without any direct relation to the society of men of which they are members.

Christianity, then, is rooted in history. It grows out of the historic Christ; and it lives in the life of humanity. The life and death and Resurrection of Jesus are its roots; and its flowers are the lives of men.

But, because the unique events which gave birth to the Christian Church are recorded by those who had faith to see their significance, their historicity is guaranteed to us, as to the evangelists themselves, not by the records, but through the response of faith which they call forth in men. While recognizing and affirming that Christ is a unique and worthy object of faith, that He is "the Prometheus that brought fire from heaven" to set light to the faith of humanity, we are unable to discover exactly what were the external conditions and facts connected with the life and death and Resurrection of our Lord. In the words of M. Loisy,* "The moral value of Peter's faith implies the greatness of Jesus and of the Gospel which inspired Peter's faith." The Gospels are evidence of the greatness of Jesus because they bear witness to the faith which He inspires, a faith which makes history, a faith which is in

* Letter dated May 11, 1935.

harmony with the highest moral and spiritual aspirations of the human race in each successive generation. For example, the Resurrection, reported in the Gospels, is central in Christianity; it is one of the historical facts upon which the religion is based. But exactly what happened—whether, for example, the appearances took place in Galilee or Jerusalem—it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty.

The Gospels are, then, historical, if by historical we mean that which shews itself to be “alive” and worthy of acceptance in the light of the life and experience of men. The events of our Lord’s life are known to us in their effect upon the life of the world; and the interpretations which have been put upon them, in accordance with the faith of the believer, give to them their soul. An exact knowledge of the facts is impossible, since the interpretations put upon them have influenced the way in which they have been reported.* “It seems, then, that the form of the earthly no less than of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of His voice”; but as the faith of humanity grows in perception, as the moral and spiritual aspirations of the human race reach out nearer towards God, so does the historical value of the Gospels increase, and our understanding of the significance of the historic Jesus widen.

The essential value of Christianity lies in the fact that men believe in Christ as the “way, the truth, and the life”; in Him we have access to the Father. The historic Christ and the events of His life, His death and His Resurrection, through the faith of men in their redemptive and sanctifying effect, are the basis of the Christian way of living. “I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.” The Gospel records are of value because they are a means by which this life is brought into the daily lives of men and women; in them we see the power of Jesus as it works in men who have faith in Him as the Saviour of the world. Had we a full biographical record of the life of Jesus we should still know Him no better than we do now; for it is faith alone which recognizes Him as the Messiah. And faith is born of personal contacts; it is in living in the life of humanity that Christ is known as the revelation of God.

The Church does not create Christ; it should reveal Him. The faith of Peter did not invent the Resurrection; it made known the fact that “Jesus lives.” The love of God, in Christ, actually operates freely and without hindrance in a human personality; and through Christ that same love becomes an active principle in the lives of the fellowship of believers. That

* Quotation from Professor Lightfoot’s *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*.

is to say, Christianity is a way of life, it is not a system of dogmas; its value lies in its capacity to change the hearts of men, and to inspire them in their ordinary workaday lives to be living witnesses to the power of God's love in them, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We have attempted to make it clear that a Christianity which is not active in the throbbing life of humanity, and which is therefore not in tune with the faith of humanity as it strives to reach out to a vision of God, is unreal. Christ must be real to the men and women of each generation; and faith alone, the same faith which creates in the human breast the urge to aspire towards moral and spiritual development, can interpret Him into the life of any particular age or environment. But the Christ who is the object of this faith must be none other than the historic Christ, the Christ of the Gospels. A unique characteristic of Christianity is the power to adapt itself to all the changing conditions of life in the world, and at the same time to recognize as its founder and constant source of power the unchanging Christ, the Incarnate Lord of life. By faith men know Jesus as the Son of God, not by the authority of creeds, nor by historical research; and as the world changes so must the forms, in which man expresses his experiences of the power of the living Christ in him, change.

Is such a view of Christianity to be identified with Gnosticism or Theosophy? To suggest that it is, is to misinterpret it or to misunderstand the meaning of the terms employed. Gnosticism ignored the fact that the historic Christ is fundamental to the Christian way of life, and Theosophy implies that there is nothing unique in Christianity; they both are theories out of touch with the real life of humanity, religious systems suitable only for the enlightened few; they both make the Incarnation an unreality, not related to the busy world of human activity. This article, and the ideas of M. Loisy, are in direct contradiction with the Gnosticism of the first and second centuries of our era. But if by Gnosticism we mean the belief that facts are of value only when they enter into human history through the interpretations put upon them by faith, then there is a proper Christian Gnosticism, and St. Paul was certainly a Gnostic.*

But it would seem that those who are afraid of the views expressed by persons, such as M. Loisy, who strive to reclothe the Christian Gospel in a form which shall keep it an active force in human life, are content to suppose that anything with

* 2 Corinthians v. 14-17 is a most interesting passage of Pauline writing in this connection. Particularly significant is the emphasis upon Christ as the living power in men.

which they disagree can be identified with a heresy of the past, and therefore *ipso facto* is to be condemned without further consideration of its value. Whether is better, to insist on the inviolability of fixed Christian credal formulæ, and to safeguard such formulæ against the unavoidable attacks from modern minds at the expense of intellectual honesty, or, to take the risk of preserving the life of Christianity by reclothing it in harmony with the faith of the modern world? Is it sufficient to quote St. Irenæus against Gnosticism in order to condemn ideas which, on examination, prove to be contradictory to the Gnosticism known to him? St. Irenæus would perhaps be the first to condemn an orthodoxy which would hold that the external forms in which Christianity is expressed matter more than the faith which Christ inspires in men; he would be the first, we may hope, to agree with St. Paul that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

To say that Christianity must live in the common life of man, that Christ is recognized for what He is by faith, that faith, implanted in man by God, is developed out of the spiritual and moral experiences of mankind, to say all this is not to suggest that Christianity is this-worldly; it is to say that it is a religion which enters into the lives of men, and that by means of it the life and love of God flow into the life of humanity. We offer no "glittering bribe to the Church if it will cut loose from its entangling low-born alliances," if by that term we mean its relationships with ordinary men and women; it is just this alliance, we claim, which is so essential to Christianity. Only when Christ enters into the life of each generation is He understood; it is in the light of the faith of human persons that the Gospel records have any meaning; it is in the ordinary human environment that the Gospel makes history. But we do pray that Christianity may cut loose from its low-born alliances, if by that term we mean its slavery to a rigid authoritarianism; such an alliance kills the spirit and power of Christ in order to do honour to a credal statue, an idol with eyes that see not, ears that hear not, and hands that handle not.

A Christian is a man who, by faith, both recognizes the historic Jesus to be the Christ through whom the redemptive love of God flows into the world, and also lives his life in accordance with this recognition; the love of Christ, the Christ of his faith, constraineth him to bring forth the fruits of the spirit in a life of fellowship with God and man. But it is the same historic Jesus which inspires the faith of every Christian. To realize all this is to recognize that Christianity cannot be confined within the bounds of unchanging forms; the records of its origins and the portrait of its Founder are necessarily coloured

by the faith of the writers: it must adapt itself in forms which are in tune with the faith of every society of men and every individual.

Monsieur Loisy, in understanding the true significance of Christ in the life of humanity, has done much to save "the fabric of historical Christianity, if by that term we mean a Christianity which is alive and in harmony with the spiritual life and thought of the human race." "Do we, can we, mean no more than that?" We mean that Christianity, whatever else it may be, must be alive, and it must be in harmony with the faith of humanity; we imply that only then can it bear witness to the living historic Christ.

L. J. COLLINS.

MISCELLANEA

"SUFFERED UNDER PONTIUS PILATE"

It is not a little remarkable that no very express or direct reference is made in the several versions of the ordinary Creeds of the Church Catholic to the Passion of our Lord, other than the particular mention of the sufferings that He endured under Pontius Pilate. The omission may in some degree be accounted for by the inclusion of attendant circumstances bearing on those sufferings. But while the Passion in its fullest measure may be thus implied, it cannot in the truest sense be regarded as definitely stated, save in such an isolated instance as when the one word "*passus*" comes into view and may be said to reflect the dominant idea. It is only when the generalized statement, *e.g.* in the Athanasian Creed, is reached, "*qui passus est pro salute nostra*," that the completed aspect of the Saviour's Passion takes definite form. Still there is no positive allusion to the sufferings as a distinct pronouncement if the particular instance of the endurance before Pilate is excluded. In the wording of the Nicene Creed as retained in our Communion Service, the precise order of the words "*crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered and was buried*" sets forward our Lord's sufferings under the Roman Governor in somewhat irregular sequence. Although this order of the words is occasionally adopted, it is more suitably expressed in the familiar form given in the Apostles' Creed in current use—*viz.*, "*He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried*"—and it would seem to be more in accord with the main body of evidence as gathered from outstanding examples of the Creed.

The earliest instance in which the Apostles' Creed appears in any settled form is that of St. Irenæus (*circa* A.D. 180). It gives the clause in question as "*passus sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus mortuus et sepultus*." It may be inferred from this and like expressions that the particular sufferings to which reference is made were those that Christ directly endured when He stood before Pilate, and to be viewed apart from the actual Crucifixion that followed. The insults, taunts and scourging which preceded the Crucifixion formed an integral part of the bitter Passion, so inadequately realized by us in its intensity, purpose and effect.

In the early interrogative Creed formula, no mention is made of Pilate; later forms have simply "*passum*." In the writings of St. Augustine (A.D. 400) we meet with "*suffered under Pontius Pilate*" and variants. Eusebius (A.D. 550) has simply "*passus*." The like clause is recorded in St. Nicetas (A.D. 450), and begins to be represented in the Sacramentaries about the time when the allocation of the clauses in the eighth-century Apostles' Creed appears. St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Augustine, Cyril of Jerusalem and others have incorporated in their writings varied forms of the Creed which found early place in the accredited service books. Irenæus gives "*et passus sub Pontio Pilato*." Tertullian in certain of his books (*circa* A.D. 203-210) has "*fixum cruce*" (*De Præscript. hæret.*), elsewhere "*crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato*," or a bare allusion to the Passion as "*hunc passum*." Ruffinus (A.D. 390) has "*crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato*," so also the Aquileian Creeds. The Cæsarian Creed has simply "*suffered*" (*παθόντα*). The Creeds originating in France and Spain have "*passus sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus*." The Saxon versions, whether in Anglo-Saxon

or Greek characters, and, generally speaking, the English Creeds, follow the latter form. There are fourteenth-century examples that give "suffrede passionn under Pounce Pilate," which may be conjectured to indicate the prevalent English sentiment. There are variants, however; one noticeable reading, "which suffred deathe under Pons Pylate and was crucifyd, deade and buryed," is singular.

While it cannot for one moment be supposed that in framing the Creeds the Passion of Christ was at any time lost to view, or that it failed in its fullest bearing to secure universal acceptance, yet it seems a little strange that the absence of a more direct declaration of so prominent a feature should not have called forth a more adequate expression of belief, and further that the clause in question should have remained uninvestigated with the object of elucidating the direct bearing of the specified sufferings at Pilate's judgment seat as an integral factor in the Lord's Passion.

The supposition remains that the clause, while it embodies an historical fact, is mainly an expression which affirms the intensity of the ordeal through which Christ passed, and as such calls for special recognition independently of the culminating event of the Crucifixion. Alone it presents an aspect of the Passion which has set a purpose peculiarly its own, conveying lessons particularly adapted to a right conception of the mysteries involved.

We are hardly warranted in assuming, in conformity with the generally received opinion, that the name of Pontius Pilate was introduced for the express purpose of establishing the date of the Crucifixion, which is admittedly settled by that declaration, and the fact emphasized. It is in the main an attestation of the reality of the sorrows that entered into the soul of the Sinless Sufferer. This objection is certainly attained, inasmuch as it carries with it all the force of an undisputed assertion combined with the course of a momentous trial in which the Man of Sorrows exercised a calm demeanour and dignified bearing, meanwhile encountering the forces of evil in their terrible array. He suffered as He contemplated the inroads made by sin in man's nature. Surrounded as He then was by many strange and diverse characteristics of the frail humanity which was ever opposing itself, He suffered under Pontius Pilate, and, being made an offering for the sins of mankind, effected the redemption of the whole world.

C. H. EVELYN-WHITE.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS OF VOCATION FOR CANDIDATES FOR ORDINATION

At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference last summer, Canon Peter Green stated his opinion that the maintenance of the Church of England depended almost entirely upon the keenness of its parish priests. If the clergy fail, the whole Church weakens. No doubt this statement seems true enough, although there are factors in the situation of the Church of England today which, however keen a parish priest may be, he cannot dislodge. Such for instance as the influence of cinemas, motor-cars, novels, gambling, etc., as well as such psychological elements as mass-feeling, self-content and pleasure seeking, which are so prominent in modern life. These and many other influences have made parochial work extremely difficult, and it is only to be expected that the clergy should feel discouraged and ineffective.

These influences in modern civilization are not likely to disappear, but, on the contrary, may easily become more potent. The trend of modern life is not towards appreciation of religious truth, but towards a secular, self-satisfied standard of life, and let us remember that self-content is a difficult and dangerous element to oppose.

The strain on the clergy will probably increase rather than diminish. Increasing strain is evident not only amongst the clergy, but also in other professions. The accumulating intricacies of scientific methods in industry, in medicine, the arts, locomotion, warfare and in science itself require a care and effort never before known. The great organization and efficiency seen, for instance, in the production of films are impressive, and who can fail to recognize the splendour of achievement in the creation of such vessels as the *Lord Nelson* and *Queen Mary*?

The way, of course, in which pressure in scientific achievement is being met is by specialized training. The sphere of effort is first determined, and men are trained to efficiency within this limit. The particular work and the specialized training are co-ordinated.

This method has been used in Christian evangelism only within narrow limits, and no doubt the reason is that human personality, with which religion deals, cannot be divided up into sections and dealt with separately. Although this is true in a strict sense, yet human nature can be studied from various aspects and dealt with differently. Obvious distinctions can be drawn, for instance, between periods of life—childhood, adolescence, and adult years. There are also the separate spheres of education—theology, psychology including psychotherapy, special missionary effort in evangelism including conversion, public worship, and other departments of religious activity.

The strain on the clergy in their parish responsibilities might be relaxed somewhat if specialists in these subjects could be placed at the disposal of parish priests in the same way as general practitioners, in the medical profession, can call for the advice of specialists.

There is, however, a far deeper problem which the pressure of the modern world upon the Church is certain to make more and more urgent, e.g. the problem of "interest." No one would be disposed to question that in the work of a parish priest interest in religious propaganda is supremely important. There is no other incentive which a priest can fall back upon to help him maintain his work. In secular occupations there is always a money incentive which employers can evoke; in these cases economic pressure is valuable when genuine interest fails. It would, however, be deplorable if a parish priest, unable to maintain genuine interest in his religious work, found instead an incentive in personal economic advantage, in filling his church. In general, economic advantage is a bad incentive in religious propaganda. If, then, the zeal of a priest weakens, his religious activity is certain to decline with it; for energy is maintained by interest.

We come then to our main consideration, how to ensure that the clergy have a "lively faith" which is proof against adversity. Strictly speaking, it is an impossible quest. As our Lord put it, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is everyone that is born of the spirit." But let us remember that we can hear "the sound thereof," and where there is no sound there is no wind. We can see the signs of interest, and where there is no sign there is no interest. We can never know where interest comes

from, but we can infallibly tell who has interest. Did not Christ Himself say, "By their fruits ye shall know them"? This fact, stated by a supreme genius in psychology, which our Lord was, is fully confirmed by modern psychological research; in the long run what we do is true indication of what we are.

A personality-trait such as interest in religion, science, art, music, literature, etc., has a definite history, content and quality, beginning in childhood and running its course as, or in association with, a personality life-line. Given a sincere autobiography up to any period of life past adolescence, it should not be difficult to trace the history of a person's religious faith, its birth and development, and to estimate its quality, content and incident.

A psychotherapist uses this method continually in analyzing the neurosis of his patient. He first finds out the elements in his patient's complaint—fear, guilt, or some inability to face life, abnormal sexuality or self-centredness, or perhaps an idea has become an obsession, etc. He traces its history and incidence, estimates its strength and advises his patient in regard to re-education and restoration.

The same method is used in the analysis of genius; the history, for instance, of the poetic genius of Wordsworth can be seen in his *Prelude*, Schliemann's urge to discover Troy is shewn in its full history in *Ilios*; in fact, whenever an intense interest arises, its possessor is well aware of its course in his life and is anxious to describe it. For this reason autobiographies of men of genius are always illuminating. This is especially true of men with religious genius such as John Bunyan; what light he throws on his religious development in *Grace Abounding*!

Although the intense interest of men of genius is unusual, there must be some interest to maintain activity.

By adopting this method the Church could discover the quality and strength of the faith which its ordination candidates possess or the absence of faith. It could also discover the true or probable motives of men choosing the ministry of the Church as their life's work.

The success which has attended psychological methods in discovering aptitudes in secular callings should encourage the Church of England to adopt similar methods.

Unfortunately the theological colleges are at the moment almost unaware of the need for psychological investigation into the religious faith of their students, although it is well known that not a few ordinands deteriorate after a few years in Orders, or shew no resistance to the strain of parochial evangelism. There are many motives other than the religious incentive which may prompt men to take Orders.

In respect to this matter there is a good deal of significance in an investigation by Prof. C. W. Valentine into the choice of the teaching profession by University graduates, which is published in a recent number of the *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. The conclusions are not very satisfactory; the motives in about two-thirds of the men and about three-quarters of the women are fairly good, although "interest in education" is put as the chief motive in only 16 out of 197 men and 9 out of 159 women; but "with about one-third of the men and over one-fourth of the women some undesirable motive is the main one, and among these students the absence of any alternative prospect is by far the most frequent reason for their choice."

The investigation was made by questionnaire and anonymously; much

valuable information might be obtained if a similar investigation were made into the reasons for choosing the ministry of the Church by priests three or four years after ordination.

It will probably be some years before the usefulness of psychological methods in testing vocation to Orders is realized. At present the intellectual test of examinations is regarded as sufficient. If a candidate possesses intellectual ability he is *ipso facto* believed to be competent.

An intellectual test is obviously one-sided; it does not bring to light a man's moral standard or emotional stability, even intellectual insight may be devoid of personality-interest. A clever theologian may not be a "lover of souls." However desirable both men may be, it is as well to know which is which, for everyone knows that a man's happiness lies in doing that work in life which suits him best. A man cannot be fully efficient employed in a distasteful job, and this is most true in the exercise of the priestly office.

We owe it, therefore, both to the man and to the Church that candidates for a life service in the Orders of the Church should have their vocation thoroughly tested intellectually and by other psychological methods.

L. W. LANG.

VERSIONS OF THE PSALTER

IN 1894 Professor Earle published a facsimile edition of the Psalter of the Great Bible of 1539, *i.e.* Coverdale's version, which is that of the Book of Common Prayer. It is in black letter with two sets of type, a large type representing the Hebrew text and a small type in brackets representing Greek or Latin additions. It may be called the first attempt in English at a critical edition of Holy Scripture. The verse Dr. Emery Barnes wishes to see deleted from the Prayer Book (*vide* THEOLOGY, May, 1935) should be printed thus:

BRING UNTO THE LORDE (O YE MIGHTIE) (bring young rammes unto the Lorde). ASCRIBE UNTO THE LORDE WORSHIPPE AND STRENGTH.

It is not Coverdale nor the Prayer Book, but negligent printers who make us bring young rams unto the Lord.

L. B. TOWNER.

THE ORIGINAL OF THE COLLECTS

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE remarked that it would be as easy to push a brick from a wall with your finger as to alter the order of the words in one of the finished sentences of Shakespeare. And the same is the case with our Collects. But—

(i.) The Epiphany Collect has lost balance. In the Missal of Sarum it ran :

"Mercifully grant that we, which know Thee now by faith, may be led onwards until we come to gaze upon Thy Majesty by sight."

(ii.) The Collect for the Sunday after the Ascension is now addressed to the Father instead of, as originally, to the Son.

"O rex gloriæ, Domine virtutum, qui triumphator hodie super omnes cælos ascendisti, ne derelinquas nos orphanos sed mitte promissum Patris in nos Spiritum veritatis."

(iii.) The Collect for the 18th Sunday after Trinity has lost enormously by expansion.

In 1549 it ran as follows :

"Lorde, we beseeche Thee, graunt Thy people grace to avoyde the infeccions of the devil, and with pure harte and mynde to folowe Thee the onelye God."

The figure of Satan as a rival Deity and the contagious effect of his influence are lost in the form now in use.

OLIVER PUCKRIDGE.

THE HOLY COMMUNION AND THE SPIRITUAL BODY

THE words "preserve thy body" lead us to believe that the devout receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ brings a blessing to our bodies as well as to our souls. In the primitive liturgies, especially the Liturgy of St. Mark, the Clementine Liturgy and the Sacramentary of Serapion, it is evidently expected that the receiving of the Bread of Life will bring health to the body as well as to the soul. It is generally agreed that in sickness a good communion brings peace to the mind and so aids recovery. Is it possible to go further than this?

If, as St. Paul appears to imply in 2 Cor. v. 1, the spiritual body is already in existence or in process of formation, and if it is attached to the natural body, is it not reasonable to think that the receiving of spiritual food assists the formation of the spiritual body? This is suggested by Dr. McNeile in *The Problem of the Future Life*, p. 113. Is it discussed elsewhere?

CYRIL H. NORTON.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE REALISTIC CRUCIFIX

DEAR SIR,

A few moments after reading the article in THEOLOGY on "The Realistic Crucifix," I happened to pick up and read an old Commonplace Book.

The very first page contained a passage from the letters of Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet. Here it is:

"It (the Crucifix) was brought from Germany, I think, by a friend of mine and placed where it now stands (on the chimney-piece) by his wife (a true Protestant) in my absence, the day before they left Woodbridge, as a parting memorial; and I have simply allowed it to stand there ever since, now, I think, three years! It has called forth frequently a kind thought of the giver; now and then, I hope, not an unkind one of our erring fellow-Christians who mistake the use of such emblems; and if it has occasionally reminded me of the one great propitiatory sacrifice for sin and transgression—that I hope is a thought to be reverently cherished, even if suggested by what some may superstitiously regard. Such, my dear friend, is the history of my little crucifix. Fare thee well, and try and think of it and me with charity" (November, 1846).

ARTHUR J. WILCOX.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

The fine article on the above subject in the April number of THEOLOGY recalls a very vivid personal experience, which I venture to send you, for what it is worth. It occurred during a St. Andrew's-tide Day of Intercession in 1914, when I had gone to a little country church to pray for the Church overseas in a world at war.

My prearranged half-hour began at 2.30 p.m., and I had planned a little "programme" of meditation, etc., but very soon external consciousness vanished and I only knew that I was praying, with the sense of being a long way off. When I "came back," as it were, I found that the time was 4.40 p.m. and I was stiff in every limb, but definitely aware of having been praying and not, as one might have thought, asleep. After gathering up my intercessions in a final "Our Father," a voice within told me to look at the East window—a Crucifixion designed by Burne-Jones, shewing the Christ as in a "realistic Crucifix," stripped and dying. By that time it was too dark to see the window, but as I looked up I saw quite distinctly the Figure robed and crowned. I asked, inwardly, "What does it mean?" And the answer came clearly, "You and the others who have prayed in this church today have given Me this robe and crown by your prayers." I went home full of an extraordinary happiness and peace, saying nothing to anyone, but a few weeks later I mentioned it to a priest whom I knew well. He said, "You know, of course, that the oldest form of the Crucifix is what you saw." But I did not know; it was an entirely new idea to me, though, of course, after I was told this I found evidence enough, and no doubt psychologists would explain the whole thing quite easily. But, explicable or not, it has remained with me as a great incentive to missionary intercession, and I do not think that psychological theories are the last word in spiritual experience.

It would be interesting to know whether the "triumphant" Crucifix is found in many churches. The "Lux Mundi" window in Longworth church is one instance, but I did not know of that until several years after the incident just related.

Yours faithfully,

E. B.

[May I thank you now deeply for your plea in THEOLOGY for silence on Good Friday? Many people must have benefited. So often the conductors of the Three Hours seem afraid to trust God to speak to their people, and it deprives them of something very real and vital.]

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

In the April number of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* Father van Cauwelaert examines the intervention of the Church of Rome at Corinth in the year 96. The article largely revolves around a consideration of the meaning of the first epistle of St. Clement. As the author analyzes the text of this document he comes to the conclusion that he finds therein no explicit affirmation of the rights of the Roman see. The authority on which it declares itself to rest, the style, and the composition imply no real appeal to a Roman primacy: it is in fact the friendliness of their ordinary relations

which in a measure has forced the expression of the Christian solidarity on the part of the Church of Rome as soon as the well-being of the Church of Corinth found reason for this expression. Father Lebon debates the question whether St. Athanasius employed the expression, 'Ο κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος? There is an elaborate examination of all the relevant evidence. Modern criticism rejects or suspects the authenticity of all the Athanasian writings in which this expression is formulated, and among these the author reckons the "Expositio Fidei," the "Sermo maior de fide," the "Disputatio contra Arium," the fourth of the "Dialogi de sancta Trinitate," and the "Expositiones psalmorum." Father Richard details the martyrdom of the Papacy from 1769 to 1790, and he has collected together much out-of-the-way information. No student of the activities of the French Revolution, especially when those activities concerned the Church, can afford to neglect it. Father C. Martin examines uncial fragments of Greek homilies on the Virgin Mary attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus and Hesychius of Jerusalem. Father R. H. Martin examines recent works on the faculty of arts during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and adds not a little to our knowledge of mediæval universities.

R. H. M.

REVIEW

JOHN, PETER, AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By Canon Broomfield. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

It is common knowledge that during the last few decades a fashion has arisen to deny authorship to those who are stated in the Scriptures to have been the writers of their respective books. In no case has this tendency been more marked than in the case of the Gospel according to St. John. It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that, outside the boundaries of the Catholic Church, it is now held by most Christians that St. John did not write the Gospel which is textually assigned to him.

Those of us who own to a predisposition to believe the traditions which have found expression in the ascription of specific named authorship of the books of the New Testament will find much satisfaction in the work entitled *John, Peter, and the Fourth Gospel*, by Canon Broomfield.

Canon Broomfield has been dependent, perhaps deliberately dependent, upon the New Testament itself, of which he has a great knowledge, rather than upon the speculations of the critics; and in his search into the authorship of St. John's Gospel, a book which combines sanctity, mysticism and philosophy as perhaps does no other volume of the New Testament, he has found it a labour of love not only to consider the textual evidence but also the very human relationship of John and Peter, John and Luke, and above all has given deep attention to the narrated association of St. John and our Lord. Concerned primarily in a search for the identity of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, he has given us a most sympathetic, nay, poetic description of the life of St. John. In the end he says, "The study which the book represents has greatly strengthened my belief that John, the son of Zebedee, was the author of the Fourth Gospel," and he points out that, on the hypothesis that John was the Fourth Evangelist, the Synoptic picture of him fits in with what we find in the Fourth Gospel and assuredly sees in him the "Beloved Disciple."

He discounts the common assumption that John was peculiarly connected with Asia, save that he lived in Ephesus. He discounts the current opinion that John the Disciple died young and that, as the writer of the Gospel was old, they cannot have been the same person. Nor is he affected by the prevalent argument that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was so essentially Greek in knowledge and outlook that it cannot have been St. John. In the Canon's view, there is no reason why, though John began life as a fisherman, he could not have acquired the

outlook and philosophic equipment displayed by the writer of the Fourth Gospel.

Then, as to positive evidence, Canon Broomfield emphasizes that whoever wrote the book was an eyewitness of what he described, and finally, he is of opinion that St. Luke obtained much of his information from St. John.

For myself, I am suspicious of the motive for that energy which has been so actively displayed of recent years by Germans and others to displace what we are told in the Bible itself. While we may not accept the rigorous doctrine of complete inspiration moving the writers of the Bible, yet, to a believer, the thought that the Church throughout the ages has been deceived in its traditions is repugnant as well as improbable. Unsettlement as to authorship may well be used and, I fear, has been used by some as an instrument to promote unsettlement in dogma, in historical assumption and in belief.

To those who wish to stand upon the old ways without sacrificing their logical integrity, Canon Broomfield's beautiful and devout book will come with a sweet breath after the wearisome destructive criticism to which we have become so accustomed. I commend this book to my fellow-laymen and even, with humility, to the priesthood as an antidote to modern sophistication and undisciplined unbelief.

HENRY SLESSER.

NOTICES

DUCHOVNÍ IDEÁLY ČESKOSLOVENSKÉ CÍRKVE. By Dr. F. M. Hník.
Edice Blahoslav, Praha, 1934.

No complete idea of the history and culture of the world up to the present day is attainable, if attention be confined to the larger countries. This holds good in the sphere of religion as in other departments. Among the smaller countries of Europe Czechoslovakia is particularly worthy of study, whether we have regard to its central position or to the past and present contribution of its people to humanity. It does not reveal its secret at first inspection, for beneath a surface which is partly cosmopolitan and partly merely Central European there is something very distinctive and very national. The Czech of today is very up-to-date, yet mindful at every turn of traditions going back for hundreds of years, too Western to be quite like other Slavs, too much of a Slav to be quite like other Westerns. Czech religion has a special claim on the interest of English people owing to the debt of Huss to Wycliffe. But one looks in vain for any recognition of it in the shape of a monument or tablet at Lutterworth. This is a matter that deserves attention.

With the establishment of the republic the Czechs and the other

peoples associated with them emerged into the limelight. Since then things have moved with them so fast that it has not been easy for an observer to realize exactly what was going on, particularly in the matter of religion. There was a widespread revolt from the Papal allegiance, and a new national Church was established, which attracted a certain amount of interest in Britain and elsewhere. But it was not clear, at least to an outsider, quite what it stood for, and what was its relation to other Christian bodies. For a time the Czechs were too busy getting on with their own work to explain themselves sufficiently, and interest in the new body abroad tended to lapse. Now it has been consolidated and forms the second largest denomination in the country, numbering nearly 1,000,000 adherents organized in 270 congregations. And the authoritative account of its origin and statement of its principles contained in this book will appeal not only to its own members, but also to friends and observers abroad who in spite of the lack of good dictionaries can manage to read the language.

Even before the war there had been an increasing tendency to dissatisfaction with the Roman Catholic Church, to which the majority of the people nominally at least adhered. Such charming types of rural piety as the heroine of Božena Němcová's standard novel *Babička* (Grannie) can hardly have preponderated. This dissatisfaction led to indifference and sometimes to secession. Those who seceded generally attached themselves to no other denomination. The number of these "unattached" people increased considerably, so that they formed a particular feature of the country. Some of them were definitely anti-religious, others were merely averse to institutional religion.

The establishment of the Republic did not tend directly to revive religion. Protestants were no longer merely tolerated, but definitely recognized. They failed, however, to seize the opportunity of effectively evangelizing the nation. Roman Catholics were less hampered by prelates dominated by the Habsburgs. But they did not regain the confidence of the nation: rather the other way. The national idealism, which had gained independence, tended to wane after the triumph was won, and narrow-minded selfishness and demoralization succeeded, as elsewhere since the war. Religion was, in fact, more at a discount in Czechoslovakia than in other countries. The educated classes were liberalized, in the Continental sense, and secularized. Such religion as existed was stale and formal, and hardly contributed anything to national culture, except where it was associated with party politics. There is no religious broadcasting on the wireless from Praha, though it has occurred from other stations in the Republic. The people even fail to appreciate the part played by religion in their past history. "If you say that there was a struggle against Rome in the past, a thousand people will applaud; if you say that there was a struggle for Christianity, a thousand people will accuse you of being a reactionary. Yet such was the case." (Quoted from *Radlá*, p. 38.) Perhaps only in Czechoslovakia would the Chalice, with its Hussite associations, be esteemed, as the writer of these lines was told, by Freethinkers.

The outlook seemed singularly unpromising for the founding of a new national Church. Yet it came into being largely as an attempt to realize the ideals of President Masaryk. The President is so Liberal that a Rumanian Orthodox has referred to him in conversation as a Secularist pure and simple. This is, however, not a fair estimate. He held, indeed, that neither the Papal nor the Protestant nor the Eastern Orthodox

presentation of Christianity was adequate for the needs of the Czech people. Still he did not want to dispense with religion altogether, but rather to develop it in a new form based on personal conviction, so as to realize the old Hussite tradition of genuine national and international brotherhood and freedom. President Masaryk's attitude to religion is positive, not merely negative. His deep seriousness impresses even a Roman Catholic as far preferable to Čapek's patronizing contempt.

So in a mass revolt from Rome the new Church started, and its adherents were promptly visited with the full force of Papal excommunication. Their repudiation of the religion in which they had been brought up was based partly upon their disgust at its legalism and Cæsaro-papism. They felt, moreover, that the Papal policy had been since the battle of the White Mountain hostile to their national ideals, and that the Hussite reformation had been stifled by force, although it is claimed on behalf of the Jesuits that they attained their success largely by persuasion. Anyone who wants to appreciate the strength of the Hussite contention may be referred to such a masterly historical novel as Jirásek's *Temno* (Darkness). The methods of the Jesuit brothers Mateřovský and their colleagues there depicted are not exactly what is understood by gentle persuasion. The antipathy to the Roman Church was further strengthened by the support its clergy had given to the Habsburgs in the Great War.

The new Church, however, stood for something more than the repudiation of the Papal system. It represented a positive religious ideal and aimed at evangelizing the whole nation from the first. It sought to be national. Viktor Dyk stood for a high ideal of sane and ethical nationalism, although unfortunately he failed to see the necessity of putting it on a religious basis. Czech nationalism is not imperialistic or aggressive. Minarik's idea of substituting patriotism for religion has received little support. The sound ideal is one of nationalism leading on to internationalism. Debased nationalism, which harps upon past grievances and anti-nationalism, whether in the form of Ultramontanism or in that of the mischievous international groups of financiers, Communists, and armament mongers, are alike to be eschewed. The national Church attained no specially privileged position. An American professor on a visit was surprised to find that the Archbishop's palace and S. Vita's Cathedral in the Hradcany were not assigned to it. The suggestion of union with the Serbian Orthodox was rejected as a threat to autonomy involving political complications.

The positive ideal of the newly formed Church is further set forth by Dr. Hník at considerable length. It is regarded as definitely depending on the Divine will, not on human effort. It lays preponderating stress on the practical and ethical side of religion, not on metaphysical dogmas. It insists on the supremacy of the moral law. It accepts the modern critical interpretation of the Bible. It requires not merely morality in general, but Christian morality. It does not seek to dominate society, but to regenerate character. It safeguards most jealously the freedom of the individual conscience. It repudiates fundamental Catholic dogma no less than modern Papal innovations, yet in spite of its deliberate heresy hopes to preserve the religious values of traditional orthodox Christianity. It seeks to reinterpret Hussite ideals to the modern mind and to put them in practice under modern conditions. It has adumbrated a theology of its own, which only claims to be tentative and provisional, closely akin

to that of existing Unitarian bodies. Its form of worship contains traditional material which seems to be in contradiction with its doctrine. The Apostolic succession is rejected, and the laity take a full share in Church administration. The Church is not identified with, but strictly subordinated to, the Kingdom of God. It is seriously concerned with the establishment of social justice, with the maintenance of a Christian standard of marriage, and with the need of inspiring the rising generation with lofty ideals.

Besides all these domestic activities the new Church has entered heartily into the international and interdenominational movements that are such a feature of modern times. It has joined without reserve in the Stockholm Life and Work movement and in the movement for Friendship through the Churches. It has also taken part with the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom. Its attitude towards the Faith and Order Lausanne movement has been more guarded owing to its heretical principles. But it has found it possible to collaborate in this, too.

The new Church has had to face a great deal of opposition, misunderstanding, and suspicion from various quarters. The Roman Catholics have been stimulated to renewed activity, which has in some cases attained a high spiritual level. The Protestants were inclined to regard the national Church as a half-way house to Protestantism, the Freethinkers as a half-way house to Free-Thought. The members of the new body for their part found it difficult to shake off the prejudice against Protestantism, in which they had been educated before their secession. Ordinary Protestantism has been presented in a form too doctrinaire and sombre, perhaps also too German, to appeal to the mass of the people. However, relations between the national Church and the Protestant bodies may become more cordial in time. It specially feels attracted towards the Church of the Czech Brethren, a select and intellectual body which has preserved the heritage of Hussite traditions.

The new Church is actively opposed by the Communists, as well as by the Roman Catholics. Dr. Hník does not mention whether *Rudé Právo* (Red Justice), the Communist organ, is still supported extensively by Roman Catholics. A Marxist writer, Grünwald, attacks the national Church as a Fascist organization intended to bolster up the bourgeoisie and distract the attention of the proletariat from the Communist gospel. It is a question whether Communism or the national Church will prevail.

Altogether religion appears still to be largely in a state of flux in the Republic. President Masaryk was anxious to disestablish the Roman Catholic Church, but the project was dropped. The prevailing attitude of Liberalism and indifference has tended to induce the postponement of any religious settlement for fear of making existing confusion worse confounded.

Enough has been said to shew that religious conditions in Czechoslovakia are worthy of serious study and careful consideration in other countries. Dr. Hník has done a great deal to make the position there comprehensible. But certain points still remain obscure. One gathers little, for instance, from his book regarding such burning questions as those of Freemasonry and Antisemitism. The abortive negotiations on the part of the national Church with Anglicans and Serbian Orthodox are barely touched on. One feels inclined to ask whether co-operation would have been easier with the Unitarian Szeklers of Cluj. It might have helped

to ease the post-war bitterness with Hungary. The Czechs welcome the sympathetic interest of foreigners in their problems, and they deserve to receive it. It is surely good that Hussitism should come into its own after being forcibly suppressed. Even if we do not speak of Mister Jan Hus as the "thirteenth Apostle" of our Lord, we may venerate his memory. A Roman Catholic critic might be right or wrong in questioning whether modern Hussitism is entirely true to the Hussite tradition. Opinion abroad will vary regarding this new Reformation. It seems to have been conducted with somewhat feverish haste, inevitable perhaps considering the circumstances of the time. It is animated by high ideals courageously carried out, and so far is an object lesson to the world at large. But is not the programme an attempt to combine incompatible elements? Can it be realized? Does it rest upon a sufficiently deep and wide diagnosis of the situation it attempts to deal with? We need to be critical and open-minded, no doubt, but is it not necessary to scrutinize the presuppositions of radical Modernism just as searchingly as those of traditional orthodoxy in any of its forms? The revulsion from the Papal system to dogmatic Unitarianism is psychologically explicable, but is it logically necessary or spiritually profitable? Will the prodigiously reduced theology conserve the spiritual values of the past or continue to inspire heroic character or universal justice and brotherhood? A Unitarian and an orthodox Christian may respect each other's sincerity and may co-operate for promoting national and international righteousness, but there is an unspeakably wide gulf between them. Have Dr. Hník and those for whom he writes quite realized the effect their programme is likely to produce in members of other communions with which they desire to co-operate?

C. T. HARLEY WALKER.

GOD THE WORSHIPFUL. By B. R. Brasnett. Longmans. 10s. 6d.

This study of the divine nature sets out to shew that God is rightly held to be worshipful, and that man fulfils his destiny as a created being only when he responds to God with worship. More than half the book is occupied with an analysis of the nature of God as living, powerful, mysterious, good, rational, and holy; and the remainder treats of God as loving, in the light of the Incarnation, the supreme act of the divine love. Canon Brasnett assumes the validity of belief in Christian theism, and focusses the implications of that doctrine on the theme of worship. He defines worship as "God's love returning to God through the medium of created souls"; that love in its passage through the heart of man "acquires a distinctive quality from the infinite worth of the object to which it is directed; it has in it a note of lowly humility, a note of awe, a note of glad surrender, a note of loving adoration."

The long and discursive first chapter, in which the divine attributes are studied, ranges over a wide field, and raises a variety of speculative problems in the philosophy of theism. We can only choose a few points of interest to illustrate the character of the work.

God, it is held, is alone creative because God alone is life. "In the presence of the life of God man is before the fount of his being, and as he views the Original and Underived he bows himself and worships." The divine power, rationality, and goodness raise the problem of physical and moral evil, and its effect as an obstacle to the worship of the Creator.

The question is posed whether there could be a closer correspondence between the world of nature and the world of morals than now seems to exist, and it is argued in reply that morality would suffer if goodness always paid, and evil always brought disaster. Canon Brasnett holds that God does not understand moral evil, since sin is irrational, and the irrational is the inexplicable; but He does understand how to deal with evil. Sometimes the speculation ranges into regions where it is not very profitable to speculate; for example, such questions as whether all three Persons of the Trinity should have been incarnate to satisfy belief in the completeness of divine self-sacrifice, whether God finds it dull to be omniscient, or whether He is amused by such creatures as the hippopotamus. The author tackles all these problems with great earnestness.

However, for the most part the points raised are worth discussion, and the treatment is thoughtful and generally competent. There is much good sense in the handling of such questions as why so many millions have not known God as He is, and have lived without shame in sin and degradation; how the ultimate triumph of divine goodness is compatible with the possibility of hell; whether there can be any order of beings wholly and in every sense evil.

The chapter on the Incarnation is interesting and suggestive. It makes the acute point that one of the chief reasons why the Incarnation took place among the Jews was "the adequacy of their realization of the difference between God and man." Canon Brasnett is orthodox in his Christology, and holds to the Chalcedonian definition; but when he presents it in the form, "the psychological self of Jesus was man, His noumenal self was God," we doubt whether anyone is any the wiser for this very dubious psychologizing. He seems to us to be at unnecessary pains to refute the statement that the Logos became not a man, but man. If Christ was representative man, He was both a man and man.

The book is a reverent and patently sincere piece of hard thinking on the greatest of all subjects. It has some useful apologetic passages, and its earnestness and honesty of thought are attractive. It has also some rather prominent defects. There is no index, no bibliography, and only a very occasional, quite general reference to other writers. We doubt whether the work has sufficient original value to stand in quite this proud isolation. And the writing is not distinguished. There is a fluent stream of words, but especially in the first half of the book a rather naïve rhetoric gives a pompous and amateurish air to matter which is often worthy of a better form. It should be said that the style becomes firmer and more readable as the book goes on.

H. BALMFORTH.

TE DEUM LAUDAMUS. By C. H. Flack. Heffer and Sons. 2s. 6d.

This little book will be useful to busy parish priests as providing a helpful outline on which to base a course of sermons on the *Te Deum*. Such a course might be very profitable and lead to a greater appreciation and more widespread use, both in public worship and in private devotion, of this glorious hymn of praise. The author has some telling sentences, of which we give a sample from page 58: "If there were no bodily resurrection the victory of the Cross was at best incomplete, for death's sting was not drawn if the Body was destroyed by it." His treatment of great

doctrinal subjects is slight, but that can be made up by the preacher from other sources. The late Dr. E. J. Bicknell's name is incorrectly spelt on page 43, both in the text and in the footnote. R. D. MIDDLETON.

THE ATONEMENT: THE DALE LECTURES FOR 1933. By Robert S. Franks. Oxford University Press. 6s.

The lecturer has, he says, been led to conclusions very different from those of Dr. Dale, and, in fact, the lectures are an attempt to build afresh that Abelardian or "experiential" theory of the Atonement, from modern varieties of which Dr. Dale tried to rescue English Nonconformity. Dr. Franks assumes, with St. Anselm, that no theory is adequate which fails to satisfy the reason, and pleads accordingly for a reconsideration of Abelard's suggestion that the Atonement is the reconciliation of man to God by the exhibition of the divine love. But it seems that in so doing he lays himself open to the criticisms which lie against both his masters. Anselm's rationalism, divorced from Scripture, is, as Anselm himself admits, too narrow a basis on which to build: and Dr. Franks is forced to reject as "ethnic"—a question-begging term—much that was central to the thought and experience of St. Paul. Also, Dr. Franks makes it no clearer than did Abelard how the death of Christ can make an appeal to men to be reconciled to God, unless it first in some operative way makes their reconciliation possible.

A satisfactory theory of the Atonement will take into account all the facts. It will consider the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection and Ascension, and the heavenly session of the Son of God, and will look forward to the promise of His second coming. It may find some use for Anselm's forensic theory of satisfaction: but it will begin with our Lord's use of the idea of ransom, and will not disdain the scriptural themes of sacrificial propitiation and purification and of the redemptive value of suffering willingly accepted. It will avoid externalism by consideration of the operation of the Holy Spirit within the Body of Christ and in His members, and by regarding the effect of the sacraments on Christian life and character. While insisting, as do all the Fathers, on the atoning value of Christ's death, it will take more notice than has yet been taken, even by the Greek Fathers, of the fact that Christians are made partakers of the divine nature. St. Anselm could hardly avoid externalism: his experience was of that semi-Catholicism which had in practice (though not in theory) separated sacrifice from communion. The synthesis can be made by the experience of these latter days, in which the Church of England has retaught Christendom that sacrifice and communion are inseparable, and that communion is not an occasional act, but a regular habit. So it will appear that the life offered for man's redemption is given for the rehabilitation of the divine image in man, with consequences that are at once contingent upon and operative in the moral regeneration of the Christian and of the divine society.

E. EVANS.

THE WAY OF SIMPLICITY. By W. E. Orchard, D.D. Putnam. 7s. 6d.

Coming so soon after *The Inevitable Cross*, this book challenges comparison with its predecessor, and the comparison is by no means favourable to the latest product of Dr. Orchard's pen. *The Inevitable Cross* is a

real contribution to theology enshrining the convictions of a lifetime's thought, a work at once original and deep; *The Way of Simplicity* reveals no conspicuous originality, and touches on too many subjects to be anything more than superficial.

True simplicity is the mark of the saints, which is truly defined by Dr. Orchard as "the act or habit of constantly referring to first principles, fundamental truth, our chief end," but it takes him forty-six pages to arrive at this definition and a further two hundred and seventy-five to show us how simple everything is! Further, we are told that simplicity "gradually establishes a habit of mind, which always sees the necessary, the obvious, the next thing to do." It is not necessary to be simple to see the obvious, but the rest of this statement is simply misguided: truly simple souls do not always see the necessary or the next thing to do; their simplicity is not clarity of sight, but complete love of God, which enables them to embrace His will even in complete darkness.

Dr. Orchard defines the aim of his book as follows: "This simple and quite unlearned treatise is undertaken in order to persuade everyone that in reality the whole thing is perfectly simple, so that everyone may know just what to do at any point, may always understand enough to take one step farther, and may have good hope, if only simplicity be taken as the guide, of arriving safe at last where God wills all men to come" (p. 4). This is perhaps a trifle exuberant, and it suggests a view of simplicity which is not quite in accord with the definition previously quoted; indeed, it is characteristic of this book that whereas the words "simple," "simplicity," occur *ad nauseam*, one is seldom quite sure in what sense they are being used.

A further characteristic of this work is that while the author sketches a good many intellectual and other problems with which the "simple" Christian is faced, he never meets them squarely, but always looks for what he calls "a simple way out." As a matter of fact, this "simple way out" is usually an answer to the problem, though not always a very good one, but the phrase used suggests evasion, an attempt to get round a difficulty that is unanswerable, which produces a bad impression on the reader's mind.

In the course of his book Dr. Orchard says many good things, but it is distinctly unfortunate that he has chosen this way of saying them. Christian simplicity deserves better advocacy than this.

F. P. HARTON.

THE VICTORY OF CHRIST. By Dom Auscar Vonier, O.S.B. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

The thesis of this book is the fact, too often forgotten, that on the Cross our Lord won a radical and complete victory over Satan, death, and sin, and that His empire over the souls of men is no "far-off divine event," but a present reality; *per contra*, that the forces of evil, though strong and malignant, have but a temporary and limited power.

The Abbot of Buckfast is a learned theologian with a real gift for making the mysteries of the Christian faith comprehensive to lay folk of average intelligence. This book is pure theology from beginning to end, and, as such, demands careful thought from the reader, but the Abbot's clarity of thought and persistence in sticking to the point prevent

it from being in any way dull or difficult; on the contrary, it is both illuminating and encouraging. Designed to give fresh courage to those who may be inclined to lose heart, it deserves to be widely read and carefully pondered.

F. P. HARTON.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY. By Father Andrew, S.O.C. Mowbray. 6s.

Those who have listened to Father Andrew's addresses or read his books will not need to be told that there is here no dry or conventional collection of "points" for meditation. It is difficult to produce a series of "live" outlines for a year, but Father Andrew has succeeded in doing it. Each meditation is divided into three parts, but each part is rather a developed consideration than a "point," and the considerations are marked by their author's originality and devotion. This book should be of great use to those who require help in meditation, whatever method they may use.

F. P. HARTON.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By W. S. Sparrow Simpson. Allen and Unwin. 5s.

When a writer wishes to convert people to a belief in Revelation, Orthodoxy, and Authority, he may make the attempt in two ways. Either he may take the direct way of Apologetic, or he may take a more devious route, and shew the pitfalls which await the man who approves of unrestricted private judgment. This book, written of course by an Anglican, seems at first sight to be a rather dry account of certain religious movements and ideas in last-century France. It turns out, however, to be a moral tale, explaining the risks that we run if we set ourselves to pick and choose the doctrines that most appeal to us.

Famous men are held up as warnings. Comte believed that he was a second Aristotle and another St. Paul, and was revealing ultimate truth to humanity, but positivism has now no more than antiquarian interest. Sabatier thought that the Incarnation was not necessary to the foundation of Christianity, nor a Church to its continuance. Albert Réville, Jean Réville, Ménégoz, and other Liberal Protestants, reduced Christianity to little more than the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The Abbé Loisy, starting as an orthodox Catholic, turned the weapons of destructive criticism against his own creed, until he came to think that God was "an ideal projection of human intelligence." It makes sad reading.

Canon Sparrow Simpson has placed his chapter on the Future of Religion in the middle of the book.

Guryan's *Irreligion of the Future* was but one of the many books written to point out that æsthetics and humanitarian ethics are sufficient food for souls that need not consider themselves immortal. It reached its ninth edition in 1904. Religion might seem to have no future in France.

Fortunately, however, the last word has not been said. Orthodox theologians and scholars are occasionally obscurantist, but they are steadfast and united. Famous preachers, even in the darkest days of nineteenth-century scepticism, exercised an immense influence over their hearers. One might also call to mind spiritual directors, such as the Abbé Huvelin,

who passed on the heritage of the saints. Men of letters—Bourget, Coppée, Faguet, Brunetière, and, more recently, Claudel and Péguy—hasten to the defence of Christianity. (Bazin and Mauriac, surely, also deserve mention.)

Canon Sparrow Simpson's book ends abruptly, and the reader is left to draw his own conclusions. We may think that the author has not been altogether fair to the unorthodox, to higher critics in general, to thinkers whose individualism is not necessarily based on arrogance and intellectual pride. But the moral remains. If Christianity is a revealed religion, if our Lord is divine as well as human, then the faith is founded on a rock, and no one need feel any uneasiness about its future in France—or elsewhere. But if religion had been nothing but the speculations of the human intellect, the French Revolution would have buried it beyond hope of resurrection. No book on religious thought in France in the nineteenth century could have been written, for Frenchmen would have ceased to consider the subject at all.

ELFRIDA TILLYARD.

FOUNDED UPON A ROCK. An Introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. By Bede Frost. The Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

Fr. Frost's latest book falls into two clearly-defined parts. Its first seven chapters are an exposition and defence of the Catholic Faith against its various competitors inside and outside the ranks of organized Christianity today; the last six chapters are a devotional commentary on the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, with a concluding section on perfection. Most readers will perhaps do best to read this latter section first; it can be read and reread and meditated upon with the greatest profit. The former section is less pleasing. From an apologetic point of view it is magnificent; the theocentricity of Fr. Frost's exposition gives it a constructive power that, in these days of subjectivism and preoccupation with man's needs rather than with the glory of God, is none too common. Where he falls short, however, of his master, St. Thomas, is in his attitude towards those with whom he disagrees. There is a harshness of tone about his controversial remarks which is none the less painful for being apparently entirely unconscious. It is a pity that such valuable writing should be marred by a defect which is bound to deprive it of much of its power to convince. But when all is said, this is a book which no priest should fail to buy; it will provide many thoughts for both meditation and preaching, and should do much to help any Christian who is in danger of developing an inferiority complex in the face of the godlessness of the present-day world.

E. L. MASCALL.

THE WAY TO GOD. The Broadcast Talks. First Series. By the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, the Rev. J. S. Whale, and the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of York. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Theology, it has often been said, is about God. That being so, these talks are, beyond all shadow of doubt, theology, and as they came over the ether they must have done much to correct the prevailing assumption

that religion is a kind of spiritual hot-water bottle for those who are weak enough to require such comforts. They emphasize throughout that God does not come to man like an election candidate, with hat in hand, to solicit the favour of his vote, but that man, by the very incompleteness of his created nature, can only fulfil himself in reference to his perfect Creator, so that, as Professor Berdyaev has said, "man without God is no longer man."

Mr. Iremonger sets the whole discussion on the right level at the start by insisting that "the first question to be asked about any religion is not, Do I like the idea of it? Does it appeal to me personally? Or, How far must I commit myself if I accept it? Or even, Does it work?" but that "the first question to be asked about any religion is—Is it true?" Mr. Whale, rightly arguing from the known to the unknown, sets his listeners the question, "What is Man?" In his first talk he shews how hopeless and unexplained man is by himself; in the second talk he shews how man reaches his fulfilment in relation to God. The Dean of St. Paul's then takes up the argument from the side of God. The question that he asks is, "Does God speak?" and he deals in three talks with the manifestations of God's character and purpose in nature, the human soul, and the prophets. His answer is, of course, incomplete as it stands, for it includes no mention of the supreme manifestation of God in our Lord; that is reserved for discussion by Fr. Martindale in the second part of the course. As far as the argument has been taken, however, it is excellent, and there can be little doubt that when the series is completed the B.B.C. will have provided not only listeners, but also the parish clergy, with a simple course on Christian apologetics that should be of very great value.

E. L. MASCALL.

EDWARD STUART TALBOT AND CHARLES GORE. By Albert Mansbridge. With an Epilogue by the Archbishop of York. J. M. Dent and Sons. 3s. 6d.

It was a happy thought to combine in one book short biographies of these two great Bishops whom Dr. Mansbridge classes together as "Witnesses to and Interpreters of the Christian Faith in Church and State," and, as a preparation for reading the standard biographies which are due to appear shortly, one could hardly do better than read his work. Those especially who, like the present reviewer, are too young to remember any except the later parts of these two great lives, will find their perspective enormously enlarged by its perusal, and those who are older will perhaps not consider it a waste of time to have their memories refreshed. This little book is a model of condensed and sympathetic writing, and its attractiveness is added to enormously by the charming photographs which it contains.

E. L. MASCALL.

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By Richard Meux Benson. Mowbray. 5s.

"You will enjoy this book, dear," said a Mother Superior, handing one of Father Benson's works to a novice. "It is so *beautifully dull*."
 "Wise words," commented a Cowley Father, looking with a penitent through a book of Father Benson's.

Since, therefore, the volume before us contains not smooth words or specious or plausible words, but wise words and stern words, and words that are sometimes terrible in their loftiness and their austere truth, the compilers have done well to give it a "beautifully dull" title. For they might, in modern fashion, have called it "The Testament of Holiness," or "The Gate of Heaven," or (worst of all) "I was a Saint."

These titles could have been justified by reference to the contents of the book. But the various chapters, on such subjects as Life in a Community, Self-Abnegation, Detachment, Mortification, and the rest, were just that—Instructions on the Religious Life.

The indomitable old man who instructed his spiritual children asked nothing of them that he had not already himself given to the Community and to God. The talks do not set forth the vague aspirations of an armchair dreamer after saintliness; they are rather the tempered steel of a fighter who knows that his sword has won many a battle.

Are the pages of the book uninteresting to you? So is a log-book, if you have never been to sea. Father Benson writes of what he knows, and of spiritual journeyings where only the bravest souls may go. He does not indulge in flowery descriptions; he gives "beautifully dull" instructions, so that other travellers may adventure too.

A member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, speaking at Cowley St. John the other Sunday, bade us have "a heart of flame towards God, a heart of fire towards men, and a heart of flint towards ourselves."

Such was the heart of the Society's founder; and such is the spirit which still animates the Community.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

CHRIST AND THE WORLD OF THOUGHT. By Daniel Lamont, D.D.
Professor of Practical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. T. and
T. Clark. 9s.

This book deserves more attention than it is likely to receive. Those who would benefit most by reading it (if it is not above their heads) are those pontifical men of science who imagine that a knowledge of physics qualifies them to dogmatize on faith and morals. Dr. Lamont's argument is too close to be adequately summarized. It will be followed with interest by those who suspect the physicists, *et dona ferentes*, and will be glad to find that their suspicions can be metaphysically justified.

E. EVANS.

DIE ZUSAMMENSETZUNG DES MARKUSEVANGELIUMS. By Johannes Sundwall. Abo Academy (Finland).

This essay on the origins of St. Mark deserves a warm welcome because it is an admirable example of Finnish scholarship, and with commendable brevity and much originality tells us what may have been the method by which the Evangelist built up his Gospel. The tradition used consisted mainly of stories without time or place attached and of controversial dialogues. These were grouped together with the help of catchwords (*Stichworte*). For example, in ii. 14-17, the word "place of ll" (*τελώνιον*) caused the call of Levi to be associated with the meal at

which "sinners and publicans" (τελωῶναι) were present. Another cause was the word "followed." Levi followed Jesus, and so did the publicans and sinners. Those who want to know about the latest developments of the *Formgeschichte* theory, the Gospel before the Gospels, are recommended to get this book, which illustrates its strength and its weakness. The latter is seen on p. 25, where the tell-tale sentence occurs: "The particle μέν, which occurs in Mark in five places only and in them demonstrably does not come from him." How on earth does he prove such a thesis?

A quotation from Lucian's *True History* is apposite. A traveller had been to Hades and met Homer. "Another of my questions was about the so-called spurious books; had he written them or not? He said they were all genuine. . . . Having got a categorical answer on that point, I tried him next on his reason for starting the Iliad with the wrath of Achilles. He said he had no exquisite reason; it just came into his head that way." So with St. Mark. Some of our guesses are probable, others have an off-chance of being right; but there always remains the possibility that much which puzzles us was written so because "it just came into his head that way." W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PRAYER BOOK. By A. H. Baverstock and Donald Hole. Williams and Norgate. 3s.

The Prayer Book was forced upon an unwilling Church by the State. "It possessed no spiritual or canonical authority whatever." "Convocation never, by any canonical action, abrogated the Missal, neither did it canonically promulgate any rival or alternative rite." "Catholics . . . would maintain that there is already a book possessing full spiritual authority in the Church of England, namely the ancient missal. The Church of England may give us *permission* to use the book imposed upon us by Parliament. . . ." In "I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority," lawful authority is legitimately interpreted as referring to spiritual authority, i.e. that of the Western Church.

This, then, is the truth about the Prayer Book.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

HUME'S THEORY OF THE UNDERSTANDING. By Ralph W. Church, D.Phil. G. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Church's most important book is founded on lectures delivered at Balliol, and naturally takes stock of much that has recently been written on Hume. But he gives much original criticism. The contrast of his views with those presented in Oxford lecture-rooms forty years ago is startling. Then under the influence of Green, of whom Hume was the constant target as the rock on which Mill rested, if I may chance a mixed metaphor, we saw Hume as the complete sceptic, not content with denying the reality of the external world, but making the mind itself a bundle of illusive perceptions. The Greenian Idealism treated Hume with the same acerbity with which he treated the Cartesian innate ideas.

Dr. Church has changed all that. He shews that the great analytical

philosopher was constructive as well as destructive. The scepticism of Hume rested, we are told, not on his doctrine of impressions and ideas, but on his "atomism" or theory that all distinguishable impressions are separable, and that no line of cause and effect could be found in the working of the senses. But he shared this scepticism with Malebranche and other French thinkers, who settled the difficulty in a way that Hume rejected. Hume's way to account for the complex ideas of cause and effect, substance and the self was to say that the mind was built by nature capable of constructing and trusting such ideas. It was gifted with a "gentle force" of association, through which resemblance and contiguity naturally constructed a mental world, and with an imagination which, looking before and after, remembering and expecting, by habit and custom and influence established the causal sequences. Hume has much to say on this imaginative factor, that accounts for so much. Whether he regarded it as illusory does not matter; the point is that he came very close to Idealism, in transferring so much from the external to the internal world. He alludes also to "unknown causes" of impressions, which may exist. Here he gets near to "things in themselves."

But about Kant. He said we know that Hume "woke him from his dogmatic slumber."

Hume's psychological analysis, that is to say, led him to the Categories, the synthetic unity of apperception, and the doctrine that "the mind makes nature out of a material she does not make." We used to think that his Idealism was a revulsion from the scepticism of Hume. Now perhaps it would be truer to regard it as having something of the nature of a conversion. It is reasonable to argue that Hume was not a wild sceptic to be corrected and scotched by a life's labour, but an analytical philosopher as great as Kant himself, who did the spadework and dug the foundation on which Idealism was to rest. Thus Green's target was the true ancestor of the system from which Green's own philosophy sprang.

Of course Hume was no Idealist, but Dr. Church's work with its emphasis on the constructive element in Hume should certainly make us ask what dream exactly was in Kant's mind when Hume woke him from his slumber.

Dr. Church's book, dealing with the abstractions of philosophy, is not easy to read; but a clear and simple style makes the discussion less difficult than it might have been.

Anyone who masters it will find that he has acquired not only a profound respect for Hume, and deep gratitude to Dr. Church, but also some valuable knowledge of the foundation problems of philosophy.

W. J. FERRARS.

THE WOMEN OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By Lina Echenstein (revised by Celia Roscoe). Faith Press. 6s.

The apocalyptic outlook of the early Church led to an over-emphasis on celibacy which had grave and perhaps disastrous consequences on later theology; but the author of this book brings out clearly its great social importance at the time in setting women free for vocations other than marriage, such as healing, prophesying, or training groups of Christians in community life; and, in its turn, through freedom of

choice naturally raised the standard and value of the marriage relationship.

Much of the evidence is frankly apocryphal, but this rather enhances its value than depreciates it, for while many of the actual events in such literature will be frankly untrustworthy, the authors will be careful only to recall such events as will be readily acceptable to their audience. There must be no outstanding improbabilities for the readers they have in mind. It is of little importance, therefore, whether Mary Magdalene travelled to Rome to influence high authorities there ; whether Martha evangelized Provence ; or Mariamne exhorted passers-by in the street to come in and hear Philip preach ; it is of paramount importance that the reader of the time should take it for granted as ordinary Christian practice, that women should travel, work, and preach by themselves or along with their husbands and brothers, and that they should be accepted on an equal footing with men, without distinction.

The chief fault of this book is its good deal of irrelevant if interesting digressions—for example, accounts of various early portraits of Christ. Some of these would have interrupted the thesis less had they formed an appendix.

The outstanding feature of this interesting book is its moderation. In an age when the Church, far from being in the van in its use and estimation of women, is rather in the rearguard, the subject is a burning one to many. One might expect strong expression of opinion from the author, herself a woman ; but it is rather by the careful exclusion of any personal bias, and by the discriminating, scholarly presentation of documentary evidence, that she carries her point so convincingly.

G. KEABLE.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NATURE OF HISTORY. By H. G. Wood. Hulsean Lectures, 1933-1934. Cambridge University Press. 6s.

CHRISTIANITY AS HISTORY AND FAITH. By A. C. McGiffert. Edited by A. C. McGiffert, jun. Charles Scribner's Sons. 7s. 6d.

Philosophers commonly, and historians not infrequently, impose unnecessary restrictions upon themselves and cramp their work. While the philosopher is wont to reject historic fact and to confine his attention to present experience, the historian often limits himself severely to what he regards as the "scientific" presentation of the sequence of events, concealing his own moral and emotional reaction to the details of the story, and refraining from introducing into it any suggestion of a philosophy of values. In each case the self-imposed restriction is viewed by the Christian theologian as mistaken, unnecessary, distorting, and provocative. He is himself at once a philosopher and an historian, and he knows that he is emancipated thereby to a larger and truer outlook. He knows that, to use a memorable sentence of Dr. T. B. Strong's, "Christianity grips the whole historic order" ; and he can neither exclude history from the material of his philosophy, nor dispense with values in his reading of history, unless indeed he be a modernist ; in which case he provides the double provocation of being a "scientific" historian and a philosopher who has no need of history, for he first strains out his history with the aid of the latest scientific sieve, and then deduces from the waste, or popular accretion, as he declares it to be, a number of ideas

and principles which are said to constitute the only value of the whole.

The two books named above are the work respectively of a Christian theologian and a modernist. They provide an interesting and most instructive contrast.

Dr. McGiffert's son, who has selected the twenty-eight short papers included in the posthumous volume which he has entitled *Christianity in History and Faith*, states in his preface that it has been his intention to provide an exposition of his father's faith. Justly representing him as one of the "leading scholars of liberal Christianity," he claims that "these modernists display no impoverishment or weakening of their confidence in the Christian gospel." He considers that Dr. McGiffert "presents a combination of scientific and religious devotion as signal as that exhibited by outstanding men in any of the divisions of the Christian Church at any period of its history"; and he discharges in this book the pious duty of setting out the evidence for the religion of one who chose to appear only as an historian in his lectures and previously published writings. "As an historian he insisted on keeping his own views out of sight, often to the exasperation of his students, who wanted to know what he himself thought." Here, then, is a book which "not only presents further illuminating studies in the history of Christianity, but supplements the ripe wisdom of the author's scholarship by a statement of his own living faith." Both editor and publishers have done their work well; and the book will leave its readers in no doubt about the author's faith. It was the faith of a sincere modernist with strong social sympathies, and it is admirably and tolerantly stated. The modernist reader will wholeheartedly approve it, and will enthusiastically echo the writer's expectation of the gradual dissemination of a free spirit which shall bring to pass "Jesus' glorious vision of the kingdom of God, of a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness, of a regenerated world controlled by His Spirit." For a longer vision and a deeper insight he will be well advised to turn to the latest series of Hulsean Lectures.

In the preface to these lectures Mr. Wood, who is a devout and learned member of the Society of Friends, enlightens us as to his own position and outlook by recounting in interesting fashion the formative influences that have contributed to the making of his personal faith. He then proceeds to expound his subject with a full and independent mind, a capacity for sound criticism, and a strong appreciation of the differentia of Christianity as a religion founded upon historic acts which relate the time-process to eternity. Not only does he reject the modernist attempt to separate value from fact, to deliver Christianity from "an entangling alliance with history," but he claims that, if the historian is to retain his faith that there is some meaning in history, it can be only by "affirming just that intimate connection of the eternal with the temporal which is of the essence of Christianity." "There are no bare facts for the historian. He has to deal with a world in which fact and value are inseparable." And that being so, it is disastrous for the philosopher to turn a blind eye to history.

This excellent book is written in a spirit which will command the close and respectful interest of all who open it with serious intention; and it is to be hoped that it will succeed in persuading some students of philosophy and history to review their position and to change it.

OSCAR HARDMAN.

THE CARE OF CHURCHES. By Nevil Truman. Philip Allan. 3s. 6d.

This useful little book should be in the hands of all parish priests, churchwardens and others concerned in the care of our churches. Many will be grateful to the author for his sane advice on important matters and for the considerable amount of valuable information he has packed into so small a space. We are glad to see he has had the courage to question the modern craze for Children's Corners. Visitors on the Continent have noted with pleasure the natural way in which children pray in church and bring flowers to their favourite altars without the inducement of "corners." It is a Children's Chapel that is wanted. In a large church or Cathedral there might be more than one chapel set apart for the especial use of young people. It is time too that someone should denounce, as boldly as Mr. Truman has done, our English peculiarity of covering the walls of our churches with tablets; these are, as he says, "really nothing but personal advertisements and should be regarded as such." He calls attention to the happy effect that may be produced by limewashing the exterior of our churches, and makes the noteworthy remark that the neglect of this simple treatment has necessitated the raising of vast sums on the repair of the exterior stonework of our Cathedrals and parish churches, and quotes Professor Lethaby as follows: "All external masonry in our climate needs a skin which may be renewed (twenty or thirty years). Unprotected masonry begins to decay as soon as it is cleaned off and exposed. . . . I am made miserable by the sight of unprotected masonry which I know is daily rotting away." In the case of larger and more beautiful churches the limewash could be relieved with bright colour and gilding. Here is a new task for our "friends of Cathedrals."

R. D. MIDDLETON.

MIRAGE AND TRUTH. Father M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. The Centenary Press. 6s.

THE UNFINISHED UNIVERSE. T. S. Gregory. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

There may be differences of opinion as to whether *Mirage and Truth* be a good book or not, but no one would deny that the Master of Campion Hall is a good man. Shepherds are only too fond of remaining with their feet firmly set in the green pastures, and shouting to erring sheep that the misfortunes which beset wanderers are well deserved, while if shepherds come after them at all it will be with the big stick. Not so Father D'Arcy. He believes that all men, whether they know it or not, are seeking God. Like his Master, he is ready to go all the way to find the lost.

Beginning, therefore, with an extremely charitable account of various forms of modern doubt, he passes on to describe the grandeur of belief and the winning qualities of the Christian ideal. Very acutely does he criticize Charles Morgan's *The Fountain*, H. B. Brewster's *The Prison* and other imaginative systems and dreams of truth. In the last chapter, *Per Crucem ad Lucem*, he appeals to what is noblest in his readers, calling them to Christ, because nothing less than the knowledge of God, learned through humility and suffering, can satisfy the human soul.

The book deserves a longer notice, and many passages, notably the lovely description of a saint on p. 29, might well be quoted in full. It

should increase true religion, and add largely to the number of Father D'Arcy's friends.

We fear, however, that he allowed charity to prevail over sound judgment when he encouraged Mr. Gregory to publish *The Unfinished Universe*. The author was a Methodist minister when he began this book, and an ardent Roman Catholic before it was done. He writes under stress of great excitement, throwing out paradoxical and original, but usually unconvincing, remarks on Science and Religion, Greek and Egyptian culture, Philosophy, Politics, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Benedict, Luther—in fact, as far as one can see, on any topic that comes into his head. He lays down the law, and says the last word on everything, as only converts can. The result is an unfinished work, the raw material for a book, rather than a book fully thought out and adequately put together.

Mr. Gregory, however, if he has the patience, might write another and a better book. If he would sit down quietly, letting the froth and foam on the surface of his mind subside, he might, in calmer mood, give us a glimpse of the depths that lie beneath.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE STORY OF CHRISTENDOM. By Caroline M. Duncan-Jones. S.P.C.K. and C.E.S.S.I. 6s.

To write a history of Christendom, especially one for young people, is much more difficult than it looks. To choose one's topics from so vast a number, to cover so many ages and countries without losing one's sense of proportion, and to make an interesting story, not a collection of dry facts, present difficulties which Mrs. Duncan-Jones has been more successful in overcoming than any writer of such a book known to us. As is natural in a book intended for English readers, the English Church occupies the foreground of the picture, but no section of Christendom is neglected: even the Eastern Churches, ignored in most books of this kind, find a modest place here, though their "unchanging" character is exaggerated. Orthodoxy has not lacked development, though of a different kind from that of Western Christianity.

The book is divided into three parts: to 1054, to 1660, and to the present day. Special features are the excellent account of the Gallican, "Jansenist," and Old Catholic movements, which appear for the first time in a popular history in English: and the chapters devoted to Missions, Latin and Orthodox as well as Anglican, in which, for instance, the heroic story of the "hidden Christians" of Japan is fully told: nor are Carey, Morrison, and Livingstone neglected, though we find little about their successors.

It is almost impossible to write such a book without some slips: if we mention some of these, it is not in depreciation of the book, but in the hope that before the next edition its value will have been increased by a careful revision of small points. The date of the first Council of Constantinople (p. 42) should be 381: in the index, John xiii. should be xxiii. On p. 54 it should be mentioned that the well-known Assyrians of today are the same as the "Nestorians" of the Middle Ages. The order of the chapters is sometimes confusing: St. Columba comes before St. Patrick, and two accounts of Hildebrand's death are separated by two chapters. St. Patrick's captivity is usually believed to have been on Mount Shemish in Co. Antrim, not Fochlad in Connaught (p. 64).

Bramhall (p. 350) was Archbishop of Armagh, not Dublin. On p. 167 a complete list of the cathedrals of the Old Foundation (there are only nine) would be valuable for reference. On p. 514 the author follows the popular tradition that Colenso was condemned mainly for his views on the Old Testament. It should be remembered that he refused to use the services of Baptism and Ordination, or to recognize in a disestablished church any church authority but the Crown; that he denied that our Lord died for us; and that, according to Dr. R. H. Murray, a quite unprejudiced critic, he published a hymn-book in which the doctrine of our Lord's Godhead was watered down.

There is one very big omission. The Russian Revolution and the rise of Communism, surely the greatest and most disastrous event in the recent history of Christendom, is not mentioned at all.

C. B. Moss.

SOUTH AMERICAN MEMORIES OF THIRTY YEARS. By E. F. Every, D.D., S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This book is a sequel to *Twenty Five Years in South America*, published by the same writer five years ago. In the present work he speaks more particularly of missions and missionaries than in the last, and the remote and sparsely-populated territories receive their due share of attention. Dr. Every was consecrated Bishop of the Falkland Islands in 1902, with a diocese comprising the countries on the West coast of the South American Continent; since 1910 he has been Bishop of Argentina and Eastern South America. He has thus had jurisdiction over the Anglican Church in the whole of the continent, with the exceptions of Venezuela and Guiana, and has enjoyed unique opportunities of observing and contributing to the life and the Christian work of a vast area. His fascinating descriptions and narratives cover most parts of the continent, and the text is illustrated by excellent photographs. The author's estimate of the religious situation, though hopeful on the whole, is somewhat disquieting. Much heroic work has been achieved by individual leaders like Barbrooke Grubb and William Morris, and by individual churches. But the disturbing political conditions (to say nothing of the war between Paraguay and Bolivia) have rendered the establishment of Christianity in the continent as a whole a most difficult task. The "debased moral atmosphere of Latin America," and its contributory cause "the contemptuous attitude which the educated classes take up towards Christianity," are clearly most serious obstacles. The pleasantest reading is that of the missionary work amongst the Indians. The Bishop writes objectively and with remarkable restraint; of his personal achievements there is hardly a word; but reading between the lines we see that the hero of the story is the Bishop himself, and if he will not write his own life, we hope some other will do it for him.

J. H. McCUBBIN.

BOOK NOTES

Our Reasonable Service. By K. E. Maclean, Archdeacon of Hawkes Bay, N.Z. S.P.C.K. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper, 2s. A presentation of the Christian faith as expressed in the English branch of the Holy Catholic Church. Written with due regard to the conclusions of scholars and thinkers by one who deals with his subject in the light of wide and varied practical experience of the faith in action. The sequence of thought is systematic and the illustrations are drawn freely from typical experiences of the Christian life. The chapter headings are God and His Purpose, Belief, Some Difficulties in the Way of Belief, The Church, Worship, The True Spirit of Worship, The School of Worship, The Denial of Self. A clear and instructive book: it might well be entitled, "The Plain Man's Manual of Churchmanship." We recommend it to clergy who wish to put into the hands of their layfolk something which will interest them and educate them in the meaning of their obligations. H. L. C.

With the Pilgrims to Canterbury and the History of the Hospital of Saint Thomas. By S. Gordon Wilson, Master of St. Thomas's Hospital, Eastbridge. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. This little book has two objects. Its main purpose, which it fulfils admirably, is to give an historical account of the ancient Hospital of St. Thomas, Canterbury. It also includes several chapters on pilgrimages in general of a somewhat discursive nature.

William of Malmesbury's Life of St. Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester. Now rendered into English by J. H. F. Peile, Archdeacon of Worcester. Basil Blackwell. 6s. This is an excellent translation of a charming little Life of one of our most attractive English saints. William of Malmesbury's Life is not first-hand, but is a translation made between 1124 and 1143 of the English Life by the monk Colman. Wulstan, it may be remembered, was the only English Bishop who was allowed to retain his see after the Conquest. His best-known achievement is his having put an end to the slave trade between Bristol and Ireland, but he has many other claims on our affection and admiration. The translation is admirable. C. P. S. C.